

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1852.

ART. I.—1. *Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine. Par M. HUC, Prêtre Missionnaire de la Congrégation de Saint Lazare.* Paris: Le Clere et Comp^{le}. 1850.

2. *Eastern Monachism: an Account of the Origin, Laws, Discipline, Sacred Writings, Mysterious Rites, Religious Ceremonies, and Present Circumstances, of the Order of Mendicants founded by Gôtama Budha, (compiled from Singhalese MSS. and other original sources of Information;) with comparative Notices of the Usages and Institutions of the Western Ascetics, and a Review of the Monastic System.* By R. SPENCE HARDY, Member of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. London: Partridge & Oakey. 1850.

OF the above two books the first is the one which will furnish the basis of the present article; it is one of the most amusing which we have seen for a long time. It opens a new subject, and lays it before the reader with a vivacity and fulness of detail, which at once makes him at home with all the scenes and personages through which the travellers passed, and fixes in his mind a clear and life-like picture of Tartar, Chinese, and Thibetan character and circumstances.

The writers are two French Lazaristes, who in the year 1844 started from a small Christian settlement a little north of Peking, in order to begin the conversion of the Tartars. Rounding the Great Wall, and the north of China, they worked their way through Mongol Tartary to Lassa, the capital of Thibet, which was their main object. After some stay in that city, they were sent back through the centre of Thibet and China to Macao, which they reached in the end of 1846. These two volumes give an account of their adventures from their first starting to the time when they reached the frontier of China on their return.

The men are admirably suited both for their task and for relating it. Quick and industrious in observation, shrewd in their estimate of character, graphic in their language, of inexhaustible good-humour, ardently loving the ups and downs of travel, not only for their object, but for their own sake, and keenly alive to the ridiculous, whether in others or in their own persons and misadventures, they would have been the very models of travelling companions; while a vein of stronger interest is kept up by their unaffected piety, breaking forth freely, though not obtrusively, in touching thoughts, and proved by a long course of self-denying and courageous action. They are Frenchmen all over—French in their dexterous politeness, their promptitude and courage under difficulty, their ready perception and use of an advantage, their cheerfulness under fatigue and disappointment—their contentment with their ordinary spare diet of oatmeal dipped into milkless and sometimes cold tea, and the well-earned satisfaction which they evince when able to vary that diet with the rare fish of the Hoang-Ho, or the exquisite rolls of Koun-boum—the hares of Tchogorten, or the delicate cookery of Lassa—French in the tinge of imaginative exaggeration which pervades their apprehension of things—French finally in the keen recollection that they *are* French, which leads them with some *naïveté* to appropriate to their country all the inventions of modern Europe, and to congratulate themselves that after a month in the metropolis of Thibet, they had taught its numerous inhabitants ‘to speak with respect’ and admiration of the holy doctrine of Jehovah and the great ‘kingdom of France.’

Their little caravan consisted of three camels, a white horse, and a black mule, on the last of which was mounted their only servant, Samdadchiemba, of a cross-breed race called Dchiaour, combining, says M. Huc, in some degree, ‘the frank simplicity’ of the Tartar, the mischievous trickery of the Chinese, and ‘the dauntless energy of the Thibetan,’—a man of great personal strength, a dogged and capricious temper, and unshaken fidelity, with a Christianity very sincere, though considerably perplexed by the remnant of his Buddhist superstitions.

We shall endeavour to bring together such extracts from their ‘recollections’ as shall illustrate first the character and relations of the Tartar, Chinese, and Thibetan, and next, the singular phenomena of the Buddhist religion, which is, in a measure, common to them all, and, in spite of Mr. Spence Hardy’s counter-statement, is the present witness through that great tract of country to the being of an Almighty God, and the duty of obeying His commands by loving Him, and our neighbour. As however we are writing not a treatise, but an article, we

shall not hesitate to sacrifice order and logical method to the amusement of our readers, whenever we are tempted out of our course by an unusually attractive extract.

The missionaries commenced their journey from a little village on the borders of Mongol-Tartary, where a small knot was collected of Chinese Christians, driven from China by persecution. Their first step, after attaining a knowledge of the Mongol language, and translating two or three religious books, was to cut off their hair, and adopt the yellow dress which has been rendered famous by the proceedings of Lord Torrington. This, with a forethought which was entirely justified by the result, they considered of the first necessity for their undertaking. It is the secular, or every day dress of the Lama, or Buddhist priest, by which that large class is at once distinguished from the laity, or, as they are called by the Tartars, the *black men*. There is something whimsical in the satisfaction which M. Hue expresses at finding himself once more in a priestly costume, a forbidden luxury in China. But it was also a material advantage. A 'black man' who dogmatized about religion would be laughed at by the Tartars; but the yellow dress enabled the missionaries at once to take a religious tone with their chance companions, and commanded their attention and reverence. This reverence was always enhanced when the missionaries themselves announced themselves as Lamas of the west, (*du ciel d'occident*;) from which the Tartars imagine all religious knowledge to radiate. And to anticipate any charge of fraud, we should add, strange as it may appear, that this reverence was never diminished when the missionaries explained, as they always did, that this 'western heaven' was not that of the sacred city of Lassa, but a more distant and unknown country; and that the strangers were not Lamas of Budha, but of Him who is known in China as 'Jehovah,'—'the Lord of heaven.' But of this we shall have to say more hereafter; meanwhile we cannot begin the account of their travels more appropriately than by their own description of the country in which they were launched on leaving China.

'We had never passed through a finer country in finer weather. The desert is often frightful and horrible; but sometimes it possesses charms of its own; charms the more felt as they are rarer and unknown to inhabited countries. Tartary has a wholly peculiar aspect; nothing else in the world resembles a district of Tartary. In civilized countries, you meet at every step populous cities, high and varied cultivation, the thousand products of art and industry, the incessant bustle of trade. You feel as if driven before an immense whirlwind. In savage countries, you find primeval forests, with all the pride of their exuberant and gigantic vegetation; your mind is oppressed beneath the power and majesty of nature. Tartary resembles neither. There are no cities, no buildings, no arts, no industry, no cultivation, no forests. Always and everywhere there is but a great

prairie, sometimes broken by immense lakes, majestic rivers, bold and imposing mountains; sometimes opening out into illimitable plains. Then, when you find yourself in this green wilderness, bounded only by a distant horizon, you might fancy yourself on the ocean in calm weather. The view of the prairies of Mongolia excites neither joy nor sorrow; but rather a mixture of both—a melancholy and religious feeling, which gradually elevates the soul without making it wholly lose sight of things below; a feeling in which there is more of heaven than of earth, not unsuitable to the nature of an intelligent being informed by bodily senses.

‘But sometimes you fall upon scenes of greater life and movement. It is when a numerous tribe has been attracted by the goodness of the water and of the pastures. Then tents of every size may be seen rising on every side, like inflated balloons on the point of springing into the air. The children, with baskets on their backs, crawl hither and thither to hunt for the *argols*¹ which are piled round the tent. The mothers run after the young calves, boil the tea in the open air, or prepare the milk, while the men, mounted on fiery horses, and armed with a long pole, gallop in every direction, to guide into the choicest pastures the vast flocks which float and undulate in the distance, like the waves of the sea. Often, however, these animated pictures suddenly disappear, and nothing is seen where lately there was so much life. Men, tents, flocks, all seem to have vanished in a moment. You see nothing in the desert but heaps of ashes, half-extinguished fires, a few bones over which the birds of prey are quarrelling—the only traces which tell that the nomad Mongol has passed the day before. The reason of these sudden migrations, is only this—the animals have consumed the grass which covered the ground; the chief has therefore given the signal of departure, and all the shepherds have rolled up their tents; they have driven their flocks before them, and are gone to seek, it matters not where, new and fresher pastures.’—Vol. i. pp. 58—60.

Yet in these vast solitudes it is not uncommon to meet with the remains of large and fortified cities, now entirely deserted, and half buried by the accumulation of soil, singular and anomalous records of a state of things which has wholly passed away. It is conjectured from the Chinese records that they rose about

¹ *Argols*, which form a very prominent feature in Tartar life, and consequently in M. Hue's book, are the dung of animals which form the only fuel of these countries. The following is an extract from his account of a day in the desert:—‘L'exercice qui suivait la méditation n'était pas, il faut en convenir, un exercice mystique; mais pourtant, il était très-nécessaire, et ne laissait pas d'avoir aussi ses charmes. Chacun prenait un sac sur son dos, et nous allions de côté et d'autre à la recherche des argols. Ceux qui n'ont jamais mené la vie nomade, comprendront difficilement que ce genre d'occupation soit susceptible d'être accompagné de jouissances. Pourtant, quand on a la bonne fortune de rencontrer, caché parmi les herbes, un argol recommandable par sa grosseur et sa siccité, on éprouve au cœur un petit frémissement de joie, une de ces émotions soudaines qui donnent un instant de bonheur. Le plaisir que procure la trouvaille d'un bel argol, est semblable à celui du chasseur, qui découvre avec transport les traces du gibier qu'il poursuit, de l'enfant qui regarde d'un œil pétillant de joie le nid de fauvette qu'il a longtemps cherché, du pêcheur qui voit fretiller, suspendu à sa ligne, un joli poisson; et s'il était permis de rapprocher les petites choses des grandes, on pourrait encore comparer ce plaisir, à l'enthousiasme d'un Leverrier qui trouve une planète au bout de sa plume.’—Vol. i. pp. 240, 241.

There is a humorous honesty about this avowal which must not be despised by anybody who has ever hunted for mushrooms, fossils, or even blackberries.

the thirteenth, and were desolated by a Chinese invasion in the fourteenth century. But no tradition whatever remains on the spot of their origin, history, or abandonment.

The character of the tribes who wander over this strange country is in part the result of their mode of life. But they have their own characteristics. Like other pastoral nations they are ignorant and averse from any settled industry. Their life alternates between a lounging idleness and fits of violent exertion, an extravagant and childish gaiety, and a melancholy depression; and there is a corresponding inconsistency between their usual timidity and the courage and impetuosity which they show when animated by passion, religious fanaticism, or perhaps loyalty, and which, if we remember right, they did show in the Chinese war. Clumsy and repulsive in their exterior, they are in character kind, simple, credulous, and gossiping. They are loose in their morals, and 'like ill-educated children,' somewhat given to lay hands upon trifling articles that take their fancy. But they are not robbers, and sometimes show remarkable traits of honesty. They are very generous, unfailingly hospitable, gentle, obliging, true, and fervently religious.

The politeness which they share with the Chinese is sufficiently whimsical to deserve special illustration. Sometimes, indeed, it survives the more excellent qualities of benevolence and honesty. In spite of their general good character, there is a mountain called euphemistically 'the good mountain,' which is infested by brigands of the most ferocious kind. They rob and maltreat travellers in every possible way; sometimes they strip them naked and so leave them, sometimes they murder them. But their manners are unimpeachable. 'They presented themselves modestly,' says M. Huc, 'and then, "My good old elder brother, I am tired of walking; be kind enough to lend me thy horse. I have no money, be kind enough to lend me thy purse. It is very cold to-day, be kind enough to lend me thy coat." If the good old elder brother has charity enough to make the loan, they say, "Thank you, my brother;" if not, the humble request is forthwith enforced by the cudgel. If this too fails, they resort to the sabre.' Again, in the following ceremonial there is not probably much sterling value. The scene is laid in Tolon-Noor. The shop, we should say, is Chinese; but the population and manners are Tartar.

'We sat down, and forthwith a teapot was placed before each of us. It is the indispensable preliminary to every meal. Before eating a morsel, every one must drink a great deal, and that boiling. While you are thus distending yourself with tea, you receive the visit of the *intendant de la table*. He is usually a personage of elegant manners and inexhaustible volubility;

competent to discourse about all countries, and everybody's affairs. He ends, however, by asking your orders, and as you name your dishes, he proclaims them in a kind of chant for the information of the *gouverneur de marmite*. You are served with admirable despatch; but before beginning your repast, etiquette requires you to rise and invite the guests all round to join you. "Come! come all together," you cry, with corresponding gesticulations; "come drink a little wine, and eat a little rice." "Thanks! thanks!" answers the company; "rather come and sit down with us. It is for us to invite you." After this ceremonial, you have "manifested your honour," as they say in that country, and may take your meal as a gentleman of quality.

When you rise to depart, the *intendant de la table* reappears, and while you cross the room, he again chants forth the catalogue of dishes you have ordered, and concludes by proclaiming the total expense, in a loud and intelligible voice. You then go to the counter, and drop the money into the till.—Vol. i. p. 38, 39.

But often it is otherwise. In the case of the simple nomad, the ceremonious politeness of the brigand or the waiter rises into benevolent courtesy. 'All men are brothers,' is a sentiment which is touchingly frequent on the thick lips of a Tartar shepherd, and it is generally followed by an act of substantial kindness. Whether the travellers have lost their way, or their camels, whether they are in search of *argols*, or of mutton, 'All men are brothers,' says the first Tartar whom they meet, and he turns out of his way to help them through. The following is pleasing. The Missionaries had offered a Tartar Lama their scales to weigh an ounce of silver which they had tendered in payment for a sheep.

'At these words the Lama stepped backwards, and throwing his hands towards us, cried out, "Above there is a heaven; below there is an earth, and Budha is the master of all things. He desires all men to treat each other as brothers. You are of the West; I am of the East. Is that any reason why our dealings should not be frank and true? You have not cheapened my mutton. I take your silver unweighed."—Vol. i. p. 340.

There is a thoroughly Eastern—almost a scriptural—simplicity in their openhearted and courteous hospitality.

"Seigneurs Lamas," said the old man, "all men are brothers; but dwellers in the tent are bound together like the flesh to the bone. Seigneurs Lamas, come and sit in my poor dwelling-place. The 15th of the month is a solemn day. You are strangers and travellers; you cannot this evening fill your place at the hearth of your noble family. Rest yourselves a few days among us; your presence will bring us peace and happiness."—Vol. i. p. 84.

Again, when they have lost their horses.

"Seigneurs Lamas," says the Mongol chief, "let not disquiet enter your hearts. Your animals cannot be lost. In these countries we have neither robbers nor accomplices of robbers. I will send to seek your horses. If they are not found, you shall choose from our droves those that will suit you best. We wish you to depart in peace as you came."—Vol. i. p. 99.

And straightway eight Tartar horsemen start in chase, and in an hour or two return in triumph with the missing animals. 'On their arrival,' says M. Huc, 'they told us, with the satisfaction of men who are relieved from a great anxiety, that in their country nobody ever lost anything.' It is true, that by a kind of Saxon law, a Tartar chief is bound to replace all the animals that are lost from a caravan while passing through his district. But the cheerfulness with which this law is obeyed by those who have the power in their hands is not the less remarkable.

The account of another rencontre will have a value for Englishmen besides what it possesses as an illustration of Tartar character. The missionaries had been drenched by a torrent of rain, and were absolutely without fuel—'not a branch, not a root was to be seen,' and as to *argols*, 'la pluie avait réduit en bouilli cet unique chauffage du desert.'

'We had resigned ourselves to our fate, and were on the point of supping upon a little flour soaked in cold water, when we saw two Tartars approach us, leading a small camel. After the usual greetings, one of them said, "Seigneurs Lamas, the heaven has come down to-day—doubtless, you cannot light your fire." "Alas! how can we light a fire without *argols*?" "All men are brothers, and should share together. But black men are bound to serve and honour the saints, and so we have come to light your fire." These good Tartars had seen us while we were seeking a resting-place, and anticipating our difficulty, had hastened to offer us two baskets of argols. We thanked God for this un-hoped-for help, and the Dchialour at once began to prepare the flour for supper. The quantity was a little increased, in honour of our two guests.'—Vol. i. p. 52.

A conversation followed, in which it appeared, that one of the Tartars had been called out to serve against the English. His account of the war—refracted through Chinese rumours, though not to our present point, is too personally interesting to be omitted. The Kitat (Chinese) having been worsted by the enemy, and the Solon Tartars by the climate of the South, the Eight Banners of the Tehakar—the army of reserve of the Empire, to which our martialist belonged—were called out.

'Then the Great Master sent us his holy ordinance. Each ran instantly to the herds to get his best horse; we shook the dust from our bows and quivers; we rubbed the rust from our lances. In every tent sheep were killed to make the farewell feast. Our wives and children wept; but we spoke to them the words of reason. For six generations, said we, we have been receiving benefits from our holy Master, and he has asked nothing from us. Now that he has need of us, how can we draw back? He has given us the fine country of the Tehakar to feed our flocks in, and that we might at the same time defend him against the Khalkhas. Now since the rebels come from the south, we must march to the south. Are not these words, Seigneurs Lamas, reasonable? Yes! we had to march. The holy ordinance arrived at sunrise, . . . and the same day we began our march. . . . "Did you fight? Did you see the enemy?" asked Samdadchiemba. "No! he did not dare to appear. The Kitat kept repeating that we were going

to certain and useless death. 'What will you do,' they said, 'against sea-monsters? They live in the water like fish. When you least expect it, they rise to the surface, and shoot out melons of fire (shells); when you bend the bow at them they duck under water, like frogs.' Thus they tried to alarm us; but we soldiers of the Eight Banners were not to be frightened. Before our departure, the grand Lamas had opened the book of the heavenly secrets, and had assured us of a happy end to the enterprise. The Emperor had given to each Tchouanda a Lama learned in medicine, and in all the sacred omens; they were to cure us of the sicknesses of the climate, and to protect us from the sorcery of the sea monsters. What had we then to fear? The rebels, having heard that the invincible army of the Tchakar drew near, trembled and asked for peace. The holy Master, out of his immense mercy, granted it to them, and we returned to our pastures to watch over our flocks."—Vol. i. pp. 53—55.

Lord Gough and his army appear throughout to have been greatly beholden to Chinese mercy. The general opposed to them was the Batourou Yang, or Yang the Valorous—a man remarkable for his military successes, his great height, and the prodigious length of his beard. His tactics were at once simple and original. When the action commenced, he tied two great knots in his beard, to get it out of his way. Then he posted himself, sabre in hand, in the rear of his troops, and cut down without mercy all who attempted to retreat. M. Huc inquired of various Mandarins, how, by such tactics, he had failed to exterminate the English. All replied, 'that he had compassion on them.'

But to return. One defect in Tartar habits is too prominent to be left unnoticed—dirt. As the Homeric Ulysses is always crafty, Achilles swift, and the Achæans longhaired, so 'stinking' is the natural prefix which flows spontaneously from a Chinese mouth when he wishes to emphasize the word 'Tartar.' Their filth is astonishing, and, as might be expected, it is even more troublesome to strangers than to themselves. M. Huc complains feelingly of his sufferings from it. 'The lice were the greatest affliction which we had to endure throughout our long voyage. We have had to struggle and brace ourselves against hunger and thirst—against horrible cold and impetuous winds. Through two whole years—death by wild beasts—by robbers—by avalanches of snow—by mountain chasms—has never ceased, as I may say, to hover over our heads—yet all these dangers and trials have we regarded as nothing in comparison with that frightful vermin of which we often became the prey.' Under such circumstances, it may have been a heroic economy of ecclesiastical funds which reconciled the missionaries to adopt, from a Tartar slop-shop, two second-hand sheepskin coats, too short for the long M. Gabet, and too long for the short M. Huc. But we can recognise nothing but nastiness in the endurance, for a month and a half, of the same inner garments, unchanged

and unwashed, while daily sufferings of the most pungent kind, ' nous annonçaient assez que nos vêtements étaient peuplés de cette vermine immonde,' and when every halt (for the sake of the animals) was necessarily near a stream or well of water.

We have noticed that an indolent and confiding *bonhomme* is a distinguishing characteristic of the Tartar. It may be supposed that this renders him no match for the subtle, industrious, money-getting, and versatile Chinese, and he is accordingly plundered at every turn. The Tartar chiefs are swindled by the 'Holy Master,' whom they regard with such a touching loyalty. The people are devoured by Chinese usurers, retailers, and money-changers, and their pastures are continually encroached upon by Chinese agriculturists. The Chinese cultivator advances upon the nomad Mongol with various success; but on the whole as steadily as the American squatter upon the red Indian, or the English stockholder upon the migratory tribes of Australia. Introducing themselves as suppliants, they become first powerful, and then troublesome. At this stage of the proceeding, the Mongol is sometimes roused into resistance, and the invaders are expelled. But more frequently the Kitat extend their encroachments till they are able to maintain by force what they have gained by sufferance, and the Tartar is obliged to recede before civilization into less fertile and genial pastures. But this is nothing to the systematic pillage to which they are exposed in their money transactions. The commerce between the Tartar and Chinese is an organized iniquity. When a Mongol appears in a commercial town, he is seized upon by a knot of Chinese, who feast him, serve him, flatter him, and possibly make him drunk for days together, and conclude by disposing for him of all he has to sell, and buying for him all he wants to purchase. They not only make him pay two or three hundred per cent. on each transaction, but they contrive to send the poor man away, congratulating himself on the kind friend he has met, and determined to come back himself, and to send all his friends and relations to the same broker.

The description of the missionaries' entry into the 'Ville Bleue,' a town of this class, is worthy of Le Sage. It would be unjust to the writers to omit it, though it will suggest the thought that, as Alexander, if he had not been conqueror of the world, would have been Diogenes, so M. Huc if he had not been a Christian missionary, would have run some risk of being himself the Chevalier d'Industrie, whom he so racily describes. We give the passage in the original French, for the *gusto* with which the whole scene is drawn, the felicity of the expressions, the intelligent self-satisfaction of which the whole is redolent, defy translation.

‘ Nous nous arrêtaâmes un instant, pour demander aux passants de vouloir bien nous indiquer une auberge des hôtes passagers ; aussitôt nous vîmes venir à nous avec empressement un jeune homme qui s’était élancé du fond d’une boutique.—Vous cherchez une auberge, nous dit-il, ô ! souffrez que je vous conduise moi-même ; et à l’instant il se mit à marcher avec nous.—Vous trouveriez difficilement l’auberge qui vous convient dans cette Ville-Bleue. Les hommes sont innombrables ici ; il y en a de bons, il y en a de mauvais ; n’est-ce pas, Seigneurs Lamas, que les choses sont comme je dis ? Les hommes ne sont pas tous de la même manière ; et qui ne sait que les méchants sont toujours plus nombreux que les bons ? Tenez, que je vous dise une parole qui sorte du fond du cœur ! Dans la Ville-Bleue on trouverait difficilement un homme qui se laisse conduire par la conscience ; et pourtant cette conscience c’est un trésor. . . Vous autres Tartares, vous savez ce que c’est que la conscience. Moi, je les connais depuis long-temps les Tartares ; ils sont bons, ils ont le cœur droit. Mais nous autres Chinois, ce n’est pas comme cela ; nous sommes méchants, nous sommes fourbes ; à peine sur dix mille Chinois pourrait-on en trouver un seul qui suive la conscience. Dans cette Ville-Bleue presque tout le monde fait métier de tromper les Tartares, et de s’emparer de leur argent.

‘ Pendant que ce jeune Chinois aux manières dégagées et élégantes nous débitait avec volubilité toutes ces belles paroles, il allait de l’un à l’autre, tantôt nous offrant du tabac à priser, tantôt nous frappant doucement sur l’épaule en signe de camaraderie ; quelquefois il prenait nos chevaux par la bride, et voulait lui-même les trainer. Mais toutes ces prévenances ne lui faisaient pas perdre de vue nos deux grosses caisses que portait un chameau. Les vives œillades qu’il y lançait de temps en temps, nous disaient assez qu’il se préoccupait beaucoup de ce qu’elles pouvaient contenir ; il se figurait qu’elles étaient remplies de précieuses marchandises, dont il ferait aisément le monopole. Il y avait déjà près d’une heure que nous allions dans tous les sens, et nous n’arrivions jamais à cette auberge qu’on nous promettait avec tant d’emphase.—Nous sommes fâchés, dites-nous à notre conducteur, de te voir prendre tant de peine, si encore nous savions clairement où tu nous mènes.—Laissez-moi faire, laissez-moi faire, Messeigneurs, je vous conduis dans une bonne, dans une excellente auberge ; ne dites pas que je me donne beaucoup de peine, ne prononcez pas de ces paroles. Tenez, ces paroles me font rougir ; comment, est-ce que nous ne sommes pas tous frères ? Que signifie cette différence de Tartares et de Chinois ? La langue n’est pas la même, les habits ne se ressemblent pas ; mais nous savons que les hommes n’ont qu’un seul cœur, une seule conscience, une règle invariable de justice. . . Tenez, attendez-moi un instant, dans un instant je suis auprès de vous, Messeigneurs . . . et il disparut comme un trait dans une boutique voisine. ’—Pp. 165—167.

He reappears with a thin, wizened accomplice, who presses on the ‘ noble Tartars ’ the ‘ Auberge de l’Équité Eternelle ; ’ the cautious Lamas, however, dodge on the road into the less pretending ‘ Hotel des trois Perfections.’

‘ Cela ne faisait pas le compte des deux Chinois ; cependant ils nous avaient suivis, et sans trop se déconcerter, ils continuèrent à jouer leur rôle.—Où sont les gens de l’auberge, criaient-ils avec affectation ; voyons qu’on ouvre une chambre grande, une chambre belle, une chambre propre. Leurs Excellences sont arrivées ; il leur faut un appartement convenable.—Un chef de l’hôtellerie se présente, tenant à ses dents une clef, d’une main un balai, et de l’autre un plat pour arroser. Nos deux protecteurs s’emparent à l’instant de tout cela. Laissez-nous faire, disent-ils ; c’est nous qui voulons servir nos illustres amis ; vous autres gens de l’auberge,

vous ne faites les choses qu'à moitié, vous ne travaillez que pour l'argent. . . Et les voilà aussitôt arrosant, balayant, frottant dans la chambre qu'ils viennent d'ouvrir.'—P. 169.

Here another member of the same firm appears—an elegant young man—'the son of the chief partner'—charged with a bundle of sweetmeats and an invitation to dinner. But all in vain—they had unluckily caught—not a Tartar, but something infinitely more impracticable.

'Pauvres Tartares, nous disions-nous, comme ils doivent être victorieusement exploités, quand ils ont le malheur de tomber en de pareilles mains ! Ces paroles, que nous prononçâmes en Français, excitèrent grandement la surprise de nos trois industriels.—Quel est l'illustre royaume de la Tartarie que vos Excellences habitent, nous demanda l'un d'eux ?—Notre pauvre famille n'est pas dans la Tartarie ; nous ne sommes pas Tartares.—Ah ! vous n'êtes pas Tartares. . . Nous le savions bien ; les Tartares n'ont pas un air si majestueux ; leur personne ne respire pas cette grandeur. Pourrait-on vous interroger sur votre noble patrie ?—Nous sommes de l'occident, notre pays est très-loin d'ici.—Ah ! c'est bien cela, fit le vieux, vous êtes de l'occident ; je le savais bien, moi. . . Ces jeunes gens comprennent très-peu de chose ; ils ne savent pas regarder les physiognomies. . . Ah ! vous êtes de l'occident ? mais je connais beaucoup votre pays ; j'y ai fait plus d'un voyage.—Nous sommes charmés que tu connaisses notre pays. Sans doute tu dois comprendre notre langue.—Votre langue ? je ne puis pas dire que je la sais complètement, mais sur dix mots j'en comprends bien toujours trois ou quatre. Pour parler, cela souffre quelque difficulté ; mais peu importe, vous autres vous savez le Chinois et le Tartare, c'est bien. Oh ! les gens de votre pays sont des personnages de grande capacité. . . J'ai toujours été très-lié avec vos compatriotes ; je suis accoutumé à traiter leurs affaires. Quand ils viennent à la Ville-Bleue, c'est toujours moi qui suis chargé de faire leurs achats.

'Les intentions de ces amis de nos compatriotes n'étaient pas douteuses ; leur grande envie de traiter nos affaires était pour nous une forte raison de nous débarrasser de leurs offres. Quand nous eûmes fini le thé, ils nous firent une grande révérence, et nous invitèrent à aller dîner chez eux.—Messeigneurs, le riz est préparé, le chef de notre maison de commerce vous attend.—Ecoutez, répondîmes-nous gravement, disons quelques paroles pleines de raison. Vous vous êtes donné la peine de nous conduire dans une auberge, c'est bien, c'est votre bon cœur qui a fait cela ; ici vous nous avez rendu beaucoup de services, vous avez arrangé et disposé ceci et cela, votre maître nous a envoyé des pâtisseries ; évidemment vous êtes tous doués d'un cœur dont la bonté est inépuisable. S'il n'en était pas ainsi, pourquoi auriez-vous tant fait pour nous, qui sommes des étrangers ? Maintenant vous nous invitez à aller dîner chez vous ; . . . cela est bien de votre part, mais il est bien aussi de la nôtre de ne pas accepter. Aller ainsi dîner chez le monde, sans être lié par de longs rapports, cela n'est pas conforme aux rites de la nation Chinoise, cela est également opposé aux mœurs de l'occident. . . Ces paroles, prononcées avec gravité, désillusionnèrent complètement nos industriels. . . Si pour le moment nous n'allons pas dans votre boutique, ajoutâmes-nous, veuillez nous excuser auprès de votre maître ; remerciez-le des attentions qu'il a eues pour nous. Avant de partir, peut-être nous aurons quelques achats à faire, et alors ce sera pour nous une occasion d'aller vous rendre visite. Maintenant nous allons prendre notre repas au restaurant Ture qui est ici tout près.—C'est bien, dirent-ils d'un accent un peu dépité, c'est bien ; ce restaurant est excellent. . . A ces mots,

nous nous levâmes, et nous sortîmes tous ensemble; nous, pour aller dîner en ville, eux pour aller rendre compte au chef de leur boutique de la pitoyable issue de leur intrigue; nous, riant beaucoup de leur désappointement, eux fort contristés d'avoir si mal réussi dans leur manège.'—Pp. 170—172.

Travellers need hardly be told that the money changers who infest these towns, make a frightful profit of the poor Tartars. They baited their usual trap for M. Huc, but that gentleman swallowed the bait, and escaped scot free, leaving the Chinese, apparently, in the very unsatisfactory and unusual predicament of having cheated himself. But of all these various animals of prey, the most formidable is that which calls itself *par excellence* the Tartar-eater, 'Mangeur de Tartares.' One such our travellers met—a fat man on a lean horse, with a large straw hat on his head, and a long sabre at his side, travelling from one end to another of Tartary, to collect the debts which go on increasing from generation to generation—a supple, merciless, energetic dun, full of professional zeal, and a kind of diabolical glee in flaying his debtor. The creature relates with savage bursts of laughter and a self-satisfied burden of 'ah—ya! ah—ya!' how the childishness of the Tartars, captivated by any trifle, wholly ignorant of business and of the relative value of things, allows debt to accumulate upon debt, all bearing a compound interest of 30 or 40 per cent., till they become a mere sponge to be squeezed periodically by the Chinese usurer. 'Is not that fair?—a Tartar debt is never extinct: it passes from generation to generation. Every year we go out to levy the interest and get it in sheep, oxen, camels, and horses. That is worth twenty payments in money. We take their beasts cheap, and then we sell them dear.—Oh! la bonne chose qu'une dette Tartare. C'est une véritable mine d'or.'

It can hardly be doubted that for all this a day of reckoning is to come. The Chinese, with all their subtlety, industry, and determination, are cowards. The Tartars, with all their simplicity, indolence, and want of purpose, are at the bottom brave men, and nourish a restless memory of the time when they were a conquering people, and of the evils which they have suffered in other times from the treachery of the Chinese; and no song more deeply stirs the heart of a Mongol than the invocation of their great hero, Tamerlane. And they cherish hopes of a time when he or his successor will lead them to conquest. 'O divine Timour,' is the burden of their favourite song, 'when will thy great soul be born again among us? return, return, we wait for thee, O Timour.' 'A day will come,' says an old Tartar, 'known to our Grand Lamas, when the blood of our fathers, so unworthily murdered (by the Chinese), will be at length avenged. When the holy man, who is to lead us, shall

‘appear, one and all we shall arise and follow him. Then we shall march in the face of day to demand from the Kitat an account of the Tartar blood which they have shed in the darkness of their houses.’

Nor is this feeling mitigated by the fact, that the ruling dynasty is Tartar. The history of the Mantchou Tartars, who subdued China some two hundred years ago, presents, perhaps, not the least galling feature of Chinese encroachments.

‘Victorem victæ succubuisse queror.’

The Mantchous have been absorbed by and amalgamated in the superior subtlety and civilization of China—their dress, their habits, their very language, has disappeared. The externals of a Tartar dynasty merely exist to invest the Chinese with an illusory title to govern Tartary. To these externals and the name of their ‘holy master,’ many of the Tartars as yet feel a genuine loyalty. But this loyalty is a frail, because an unreal, principle. And it is impossible not to expect that as soon as any principle of union is found sufficiently strong and active to combine, and impel in one direction the tribes and families of Tartary, the hopes and recollections which are still smouldering in that country—their consciousness of physical and moral superiority, and not least, the pressure, always pregnant with revolutions, of overwhelming private debt, will result in a Mongol rebellion. And such a principle is to be found in their religion,—a structure equally remarkable in its theology, morals, and polity, deeply interesting as claiming to be the religion of three hundred millions of our fellow-creatures, and astonishing from the parallels which it exhibits to different elements and phases of the Christian religion.

To this we shall recur hereafter at length. But we cannot proceed to Thibet without explaining some leading points of Budhism according to M. Huc’s statement of them, which, however, differs from that of Mr. Spence Hardy. Our readers are probably aware that the Budhists hold the doctrine of metempsychosis—they believe, that is to say, that every soul passes through a variety of lives, enjoying the reward, or suffering the punishment in each for the works which it has done in its previous lives, until, at last, it shall have accumulated sufficient merit to entitle it to the final reward of *nirwana*, annihilation, or absorption into the Deity. That Deity meanwhile is undergoing a multitude of incarnations on earth. The divine persons, who are produced by these incarnations, are called living Budhas, or Chaberon. They are to be found in considerable numbers; but the sovereign presence of the Deity is in the Talé-Lama, the Monarch of Thibet, who dwells at

Lassa, the Holy City of Buddhism. The whole system is administered by an immense body of Lamas—unmarried priests, who are partly scattered through the country, partly collected in establishments, bearing a considerable analogy to Christian monasteries. Most of these are presided over by a living Buddha, exercising by himself or his deputy a large amount of temporal as well as spiritual authority. Throughout Tartary these monasteries are subject in temporal things to the Emperor of China; in things spiritual, to the Talé-Lama. In Thibet, they are in both respects equally subject to the spiritual authority at Lassa. This short sketch will probably suffice to render intelligible, as well what we shall have to say respecting the political position of Thibet, as our missionaries' adventures in that city, to which they had been directed from every quarter as the source of spiritual light and authority, and the special residence of Buddhist divinity; in which they were most deeply interested, as the stronghold of that religion on which they had declared war, and for the conversion of which they had deliberately reserved and prepared themselves.

First, however, we shall view Thibet and its capital simply in its political and social aspect. The constitution of the country, if it can so be called, is, of course, despotic. In theory the Talé-Lama is its absolute sovereign, with a power only limited by certain traditional rules, inherited from Tsong-Kaba, the inspired reformer of Buddhism. In fact, however, he is a mere puppet, contenting himself at most with prescribing religious ceremonies, and receiving the adoration of his subjects. Nor could it well be otherwise. M. Huc suggests that the very greatness of his pretensions would prevent him from descending to the regulation of political business. But another less transcendental reason suggests itself. As the divine soul of the Talé-Lama is supposed by his death merely to migrate from one human body to another, it follows that till the Sovereign dies, his successor cannot be born. Every reign, therefore, begins by a long minority, during which, not only is the Sovereign's power in abeyance, but he himself is educated into nonentity. Of course such a state of things, if left to take care of itself, would soon become intolerable, and consequently the Government of Thibet must be so framed as to go on independently of its ostensible head. It is therefore practically administered by the Prime Minister or Nomekhan—himself also, not only a Lama, but a Chaberon, who holds his office for life, and is assisted by a council of four removable laymen, called Kalons. Subject to these ministers the general administration of affairs is in the hands of the priesthood. Each district is governed by a kind of Cardinal Legate, called a Lama Hou-

touktou. These petty princes, when the Talé-Lama dies, elect, or rather discover, his successor. They govern their respective provinces in a rude and independent kind of way, being apparently persons of a decidedly religious turn, but excessively warlike, not to say quarrelsome, habits.

The reader will be at once struck by certain elements of likeness between Lassa and Rome. So was M. Huc. 'Nous avons déjà parlé,' he says, 'des nombreuses et frappantes analogies qui existent entre les rites lamanesques et le culte Catholique. Rome et Lha-ssa—le Pape et le Talé-Lama pourraient encore nous fournir des rapprochemens pleins d'intérêt. Le gouvernement Thibétain étant purement lamanesque paraît en quelque sorte être calqué sur le gouvernement des états Pontificaux,' and as is usually the case, a variety of subordinate coincidences and contrasts spring out of or illustrate this general analogy of position. Lassa, like Rome, teems with temples, contrasting strongly with its dirty and impracticable streets. Like Rome it possesses the greatest, most venerated, and most sumptuous temple which Budhism boasts of, the object of devout curiosity to the Budhist world. Like Rome, it swarms with pilgrims, is infested by beggars, and is enlivened or dignified by constant religious ceremonials, while, unlike Rome, it is a place of considerable commercial activity, and its inhabitants are prosperous and contented. The Thibetan, fierce, devotional and charitable to excess, might find his parallel in the Trasteverini; and the bells, which, if we remember right, mark the hour of the Ave Maria and the approach of sunset at Rome, may stand against a custom of Lassa, so beautiful that we cannot help extracting here M. Huc's account of it.

'There is a very touching custom at Lassa; which we were, in a manner, jealous of finding among the heathen. In the evening, when the day begins to decline, all the Thibetans leave off work, and meet together, men, women, and children, according to their sex and age, in the principal quarters of the town and in the public places. As soon as the groups are formed, every one crouches on the ground, and they begin to chant some prayers, slowly and half aloud. The religious music which arises from the midst of these numerous parties, produces in the whole town a great and solemn harmony, which makes a strong impression on the mind. The first time that we witnessed this scene, we could not refrain from making a sad comparison between this pagan town where every one prayed together, and those European cities where people would be ashamed to sign themselves openly with the cross.'—Vol. ii. p. 337.

But the irreligious and disaffected middle class, so formidable in the European metropolis, is here absent. The inhabitants of Lassa are fanatically attached to their sovereign, and obey him in matters when obedience is rather trying. Pius the IXth would scarcely venture to arrest the corruption of morals in the

pontifical city, by compelling all the women to daub their faces with a parti-coloured varnish. Yet this custom was imposed upon the Thibetan women, by an austere Nomekhan; and is still in *viridi observantia*, not, it is alleged, without some effect on the still loose manners of the country.

But the popular hierarchy and warlike people of Thibet are not less exposed to Chinese encroachment than their Tartar neighbours. It comes, however, in a different form. In Tartary an easy and simple barbarism is oppressed by a subtle and over-reaching civilization. In Thibet an energetic, but artless and ill-compacted nation is tricked, baffled and managed by the diplomacy of a powerful neighbour. The strength of the country is turned against itself, factions are encouraged to destroy each other, and the Chinese Ambassador (the resident at Lassa, as he would be called in Hindostan), rules by holding the balance. A great step had been taken shortly before our travellers' arrival at Lassa. For some time before that period, the transmigrations of the Talé-Lama had been alarmingly frequent. He never attained his majority, and a popular opinion gained ground that the Nomekhan of the day, an ambitious man, who did not wish his supremacy to be interfered with, was at the bottom of this phenomenon; in short, that the poor boys were successively made away with before they could become independent. The idea grew, till at last the Kalons themselves invoked the interference of the Chinese Emperor. The protection of a minor against an ambitious minister is a hacknied pretext for usurpation, and it was adopted with alacrity. It was determined to coerce and punish the traitorous Nomekhan. But this, at best, was no easy matter. For be the other circumstances what they might, the Nomekhan was also a Chaberon; and to coerce a divinity in the midst of a warlike and fanatical population, required all the adroitness and courage which the best man in China could put in play. The best man was accordingly selected for the operation. Our readers will be interested to learn that he was an old friend of theirs, no less a person than the Mandarin Keyen, or Ki-Chan, who alone had the capacity to estimate the power of England, and the courage to negotiate and conclude an ignominious peace. When the affair was finished, and it became clear that the Chinese had given in, Ki-Chan was disgraced for his pains. His property (of which he had amassed an enormous quantity) was confiscated, his house rased, his wives sold by auction, and himself banished to Tartary. But emergencies bring the ablest man to the top again, and the Thibetan crisis restored Ki-Chan, if not to favour, at least to employment. He justified the expectations of his friends. Without fighting, but not without driving bamboo splinters up

the nails of all the Nomekhan's household, he contrived to arrest, try and condemn that personage—to transport him, avowedly by authority of the Emperor, to Tartary—to constitute a regency in the person of the Chief Kalon—and, in the capacity of ambassador, to establish himself over all as the avowed protector of the Talé Lama, and the actual controller of the native government.

This was the state of things when the missionaries arrived at Lassa. They returned themselves duly to the police, and were for a short time unmolested. In fact, strangers are generally well received and little interfered with at Lassa, and the missionaries were at first no exception. One day, however, their surprise was excited by a series of visitors, who, in default of anything better to buy, insisted upon entering into negotiation for the purchase of their two old saddles. The purchase was evidently a pretext, and was left unfinished; but before our travellers had well decided what to think of it, they were summoned to present themselves before the Regent. They found him attended by four Lamas, 'au maintien modeste et composé,' two Chinese, 'dont le regard était plein de finesse,' and a grave, bearded and turbaned Mussulman. They were examined with an odd mixture of gravity, curiosity, good-humour, and simplicity. Were they Pelins? No, they were French. Could they write? Yes. Would they write something in their own language. They wrote in French, 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' Would they translate it? They rewrote it in Thibetan, Tartar, and Chinese. 'Yes,' said the Regent, 'it is true. You are men of wonderful learning. Here you can write in all languages, and you express thoughts as deep as those which we find in our books of prayers.' Then shaking his head slowly he repeated, 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' Their examination before the Chinese ambassador was more hostile and menacing. At last it appeared that all this was to issue in a strict visitation of their baggage. The truth was that both the Chinese and the Thibet authorities were horridly afraid of the English, the Yen-gee-dzee, or *Pelins de Galgata* (Calcutta) as M. Huc tells us we are called in Tartary and Thibet; and their nerves were excited into a perfectly morbid state by a mysterious event which had recently occurred. English accounts state on the best authority, that the well-known traveller, Moorcroft, died in 1825 on the road from Herat to Balk. But, according to the Thibetan account, collected and verified by M. Huc, he lived at Lassa for twelve years afterwards in the character of a Kachmerian. Nor even then would his country have been discovered if he had not been accidentally

assassinated by robbers. The government pursued the brigands and recovered part of his effects, from which they found, to their great discomposure, not only who he was, but also that he had been employing his time in making a variety of important maps and drawings. The consequence was a keen jealousy of any traveller who might possibly turn out to be a Pelin of Galgata, and an apprehension, amounting to horror, of anything which could be taken for a plan of their country. Our travellers were suspected of being map makers, and after some friendly intimations from the Regent that, if it were so, they had better own it, the charge was tested by a solemn examination of their property. All the notabilities assisted; the ambassador, the Regent, secretaries, lamas, and attendants—all equally curious, all equally astonished at the books, medals, prints and ecclesiastical ornaments, of which the missionaries exhibited an imposing, at least, if not a handsome, collection. What follows is so extremely characteristic of all parties—the clever and showy Chinese—the shrewd Frenchmen, and the well-intentioned Regent, that we shall extract it in full:—

‘The Regent and Ki-Chan, whose minds were of a more elevated cast, and who certainly did not covet our treasures, like the vulgar, had not less forgotten their office of judges. The sight of our beautiful coloured pictures was too much for them. The Regent clasped his hands, looking fixedly, with his mouth half open, while Ki-Chan harangued, played the man of knowledge, and explained to the audience how the French were the most famous artists in the world. Formerly, he said, he had known a French missionary at Pekin who made portraits which were so like, it was quite alarming. He kept his paper hidden in the sleeve of his robe, caught the features by stealth, and in the smoking of a pipe, all was done. Ki-Chan asked if we had not some watches, telescopes, magic lanterns, &c. We then opened a little box which no one had noticed, and which contained a microscope. We arranged its different parts, and none had eyes for anything but this strange machine of pure gold, and which, undoubtedly, was about to work wonders. Ki-Chan alone understood that it was a microscope. He explained it to the public with a good deal of pretension and vanity. Then he begged us to put some animalculæ on the object glass. We looked at his Excellency out of the corners of our eyes, then we took the microscope down bit by bit, and packed it into its box. “We thought,” said we to Ki-Chan, quite in a parliamentary tone, “that we had come here to undergo a sentence, not to play a comedy.” “What sentence have we to give?” he said, drawing himself up hastily. “We wished to examine your goods; to find out exactly what you are. That’s all.” “And the maps, have you forgotten them?” “Yes, yes, that is the point, where are your maps?” “Here they are;” and we unfolded the three maps which we possessed—a map of the world; one on Mercator’s projection, and one of the Chinese empire. The production of these maps fell like a thunder-bolt to the Regent. The poor man changed colour two or three times in a minute, as if we had unfolded our sentence of death. “We are happy,” we said to Ki-Chan, “to have met you in this country. If unfortunately you had not been here, we should have found it impossible to convince the authorities of Thibet that we had not drawn these maps ourselves. But for a well-

instructed man like you,—a man who knows European affairs, it is easy to see that these maps are not our workmanship." Ki-Chan seemed highly flattered by our compliment. "It is evident," he said, "at a glance, that these maps are printed. Here, look," he said to the Regent, "these men did not make the maps; they were printed in France. You don't understand how to discriminate between things of this kind; but I have been long used to articles that come from the West." These words worked like a charm upon the Regent; his countenance expanded; he looked at us with eyes sparkling with pleasure, and made us a gracious inclination of the head, as if to say, "It is well; you are honest fellows."

'It was impossible to proceed further without giving a geographical lesson. We charitably yielded to the desire of the Regent and the Chinese Ambassador. We pointed out on Mercator's map, China, Thibet, Tartary, and all the other countries on the globe. The Regent was overcome when he saw how far we were from our country, and what a long journey we had had to make, both by sea and land, to come and visit him in the capital of Thibet. He looked at us with bewilderment; then he held up the thumb of his right hand, saying, "You are men like that,"—which means in the figurative language of Thibet, "You are superlative men." After having recognised the principal points of Thibet, the Regent asked us where Calcutta was. "Here," said we, pointing out a small circle on the shores of the sea. "And Lassa! where is Lassa?" "Here." The Regent's eyes and finger passed from Lassa to Calcutta, and from Calcutta to Lassa. "The Pelins of Calcutta are very near our frontiers," said he, making a face and shaking his head. "Never mind," he then added, "Here are the Himalaya mountains!"—Vol. ii. pp. 317—319.

The visit ended in a complete triumph. It was settled, to the satisfaction of everybody, that the missionaries were Frenchmen, *i.e.* something different from English; and that not being map-makers, they might preach their religion as much as they pleased. They were at once established in apartments belonging to the Regent, when they lost no time in establishing and adorning a chapel, and soon, according to their own account, became rather the vogue at Lassa. Of course some persons attended their services from mere curiosity; some were interested; some appeared to be struck by the truths of Christianity, and earnestly anxious to study it. One of the secretaries of Ki-Chan even professed an intention to conform so soon as he should be disengaged from the embassy. One real and, unless the story is highly coloured, very remarkable case of conversion occurred.

'A physician, a native of Yun-Nan, showed a more generous spirit. From his first arrival at Lassa, this young man led so strange a life, that every one called him the *Chinese hermit*. He never went out but to see the sick, and usually he only visited the poor. The rich might send for him as much as they pleased, he did not condescend to attend, unless forced by necessity, for from the poor, to whose service he had devoted himself, he took nothing. The time that was not spent in visiting the sick, was devoted to study: he spent the greater part of the night over his books. He slept little, and took only one meal during the day of a little barley meal, never tasting meat. His very aspect showed that he led a very

severe life, his face was extremely pale and thin; and though he was at most but thirty years old, his hair was almost quite white.

'One day he came to see us while we were reciting the breviary in our little chapel: he stopped at a few paces from the door, and waited gravely and in silence. A large coloured picture of the crucifixion had no doubt fixed his attention; for directly we had finished our prayers, he asked us abruptly, and without the usual greetings, to explain to him what that picture meant. When we had complied with his request, he crossed his arms on his breast, and without saying a single word, he remained immovable, with his eyes fixed on the picture of the crucifixion; in this posture he remained nearly half an hour;—his eyes at last filled with tears, he stretched his arms towards Christ, then fell on his knees, touched the ground with his forehead three times, and got up again, crying out, "There is the only Budha that men ought to worship." Then he turned towards us, and bowing low, added, "You are my masters, take me for your disciple."

'The behaviour of this man moved us strangely; we could not but believe that Divine grace had powerfully touched his heart. We briefly laid before him the principal points of the Christian doctrine, and to all that we said, he merely answered with a surprising expression of faith; "I believe!" We gave him a small crucifix of copper gilt, and asked if he would accept it. He answered only by an eager inclination of the head;—as soon as he had the crucifix in his hands, he begged us to give him a string, and immediately hung it round his neck; he wished then to know what prayer he might say before the cross. "We will lend you," we said, "some Chinese books, where you will find some explanations of our doctrines and many forms of prayer." "It is well, my masters, but I wish to have a short easy prayer, which I may learn in a moment, and repeat often and everywhere." We taught him to say "Jesus, Saviour of the world, have mercy upon me." For fear of forgetting these words, he wrote them upon a piece of paper, which he put in a little purse hanging to his girdle; he left us, assuring us that the recollection of this day would never be effaced from his memory.

'This young physician engaged eagerly in learning the truths of Christianity. And it was remarkable that he did not seek to conceal the faith which he had in his heart. When he came to see us, or when we met him in the streets, his crucifix was always glittering on his breast, and he never failed to accost us, saying, "Jesus, Saviour of the world, have mercy upon us." It was the formula he used to greet us.'—Vol. ii. pp. 325—328.

But a work, in one sense more important, seemed to open itself in the conversion of the Regent himself, on whom they flattered themselves that they had made considerable impression. He appears to have been, what we should call in this country, a valuable public servant, clear-sighted, rapid, methodical, experienced, sufficiently, but not unduly, adroit, able to combine active employment with habits of study and management of men, and quick in apprehending and adopting the most effectual means of attaining his object. The Missionaries particularly admired the kindness and courtesy of his manners, the great beauty of his hand-writing, and the ease with which he knocked off business, through his secretaries, '*comme en se jouant*,' without interrupting his conversations with them. At the same time he was not a master-spirit. In the capital

of his own country, and with all the martial fanaticism of his countrymen to work upon, he was an instrument of the Chinese Emperor, and bent before the representative of that unprincipled and cowardly people.

The following is a specimen of the missionaries' religious intercourse with him.

'The Regent was very fond of religious discussions, which generally formed the principal subjects of our conversation. He began by these remarkable words,—“ You have undertaken all your long journeys only with a religious object: you are right, for religion is the important business of men; I see that on this subject the French and the Thibetans think alike. We are not at all like the Chinese, who think nothing of the concerns of the soul. However, your religion is not the same as ours; it concerns us to know which is the true one. We will then examine both attentively and honestly; if yours is true we will adopt it; how could we refuse to do so? If, on the contrary, it is ours, I think you will be reasonable enough to follow it.” This state of mind appeared to us excellent; we could not, for the time, desire anything better.

'We began by Christianity. The Regent, always courteous in his intercourse with us, declared that, as we were his guests, our faith ought to take precedence. We brought under review, successively, the dogmatic and moral truths. To our great astonishment nothing seemed to surprise the Regent. “ Your religion,” he repeated, continually, “ is like ours; the truths are the same, we differ only in our explanations. You have, no doubt, found much to contradict in all that you have seen and heard in Tartary and Thibet; but you must not forget that the numerous errors and superstitions that you have observed, have been introduced by ignorant Lamas, and are rejected by learned Budhists.” He only allowed two points of difference between us, the origin of the world and the transmigration of souls. The belief of the Regent, though it seemed sometimes to approach Catholic doctrine, lost itself, nevertheless, in a vast Pantheism; but he contended that we arrived also at the same conclusions, and he tried hard to convince us of it.

'The Thibetan language, essentially religious and mystic, expresses with great clearness and precision all the ideas which concern the human soul and Divinity. Unfortunately, we were not well skilled in this language, and were obliged, in our conversations with the Regent, to have recourse to the Kashmir Governor, as our interpreter; and as he was not very skilful in translating metaphysical ideas into Chinese, it was often very difficult for us to understand one another. One day the Regent said to us; “ Truth is clear in itself, but if it is wrapped up in dark words, one cannot understand it. As long as we are obliged to communicate through Chinese, it will be impossible to understand each other. Till you can speak Thibetan clearly we shall never talk to any purpose.” None could be more alive than we were to the justice of this observation. We answered the Regent that we were most anxious to master the language of Thibet, and, in fact, were working hard at it every day. “ If you like,” he said, “ I will make it more easy to you.” He called a servant and spoke a few words to him, which we did not understand. A very young man, elegantly dressed, immediately made his appearance, and saluted us gracefully. “ This is my nephew,” said the Regent, “ I give him to you as pupil and master; he shall pass the whole day with you, so that you can practise Thibetan, and in return you shall give him lessons in Chinese and Mantchou.” We gratefully accepted this proposal, and we were really enabled in this way to make rapid progress in the language of the country.”—Vol. ii. pp. 329—331.

In return, the missionaries^{*} instructed him, not only in the truths of Christianity, but in the grandeur of their country—unhesitatingly, and, we doubt not, in the most perfect good faith, crediting the *grande Nation*, with all the inventions and wonders of civilized Europe. ‘All that we told him of steam-boats, railroads, aéronauts, lighting by gas, telegraphs, daguerreo-types, and all our manufactures, filled him with amazement, and gave him the highest idea of the greatness and power of — France.’ At last he took to learning French. The account of his first lesson has about it something characteristic of the man’s intelligence.

‘One evening we brought him, as he desired, a French alphabet, with the sound of each letter written above it in Thibetan characters. He glanced at it, and when we wished to give him some explanation, answered that it was not necessary, for what we had written was very clear.

‘The next day, when we came before him, he asked what was the name of our Emperor. “Our Emperor is called Louis Philippe.” “Louis Philippe, Louis Philippe! very well.” He took his pencil and began to write: in an instant he gave us a bit of paper, on which was written, in very well formed letters, L-O-U-Y F-I-L-I-P-E.’—Vol. ii. p. 334.

The serious teachableness with which this Thibetan of evident capacity and apparent honesty attaches himself to the foreign missionary, contrasts favourably with the clever and confident self-importance of the Chinese ambassador. Ki-Chan, however, was the bolder and abler man, of greater penetration and wider experience, and his conferences with our French friends are certainly not less amusing.

‘He summoned us twice or thrice,’ says M. Huc, ‘to talk politics, or, to use the Chinese expression, to say idle words. We were much surprised to find him so well-informed on the affairs of Europe. He spoke much to us of the English and of Queen Victoria. “It appears,” he said, “that that woman has a good understanding; but her husband, in my opinion, plays a very ridiculous part; she does not let him meddle with anything. She has got a garden laid out for him full of fruit-trees, and all kinds of flowers, and there he is always shut up, passing all his time walking about. They say, that in Europe there are other kingdoms where the women govern. Is that true? are their husbands also shut up in gardens? Have you this custom in the kingdom of France?” “No, in France the women are in the gardens, and the men occupy themselves in business.” “That is reasonable, to act otherwise is disorderly.”’—Vol. ii. pp. 334, 335.

Whatever our gracious Queen might think, Prince Albert might fairly demur to this evidence of Ki-Chan’s accurate knowledge of the affairs of Europe, unless, indeed, the fruit-garden may be taken as a Chinese anticipation of the Great Crystal Palace. But to proceed.

‘Ki-Chan asked us about Palmerston, and whether he had still charge of Foreign Affairs; “and Ilu, (Elliott,) what is become of him—do you know?” “He has been recalled; your fall caused his.” “It is a pity. Ilu had a

good heart; but he did not know how to take a resolution. Has he been put to death or exiled?" "Neither the one nor the other. They do not go so roundly to work in Europe as in Pekin." "Yes, that is true; your mandarins are happier than we are. Your Government is better than ours; our Emperor cannot know everything, and yet he judges everything; and no one can say anything against his acts. Our Emperor says to us, 'See, this is white.' We prostrate ourselves, and answer, 'Yes, that is white.' He then shows us the same object, and says, 'See, this is black.' We prostrate ourselves again, and answer, 'Yes, that is black.'" "But if you said that a thing cannot be both white and black?" "The emperor would perhaps say to him who was so bold, 'You are right;' but, at the same time, he would cause him to be immediately strangled or beheaded. Oh! we have not, as you have, an assembly of all the chiefs, (Tchoung-Teou-Y, so Ki-Chan called our *Chambre des Députés*.) If your Emperor wished to act contrary to justice, your Tchoung-Teou-Y would prevent his desire." —Vol. ii. pp. 335, 336.

Ki-Chan was a member of the Chinese cabinet when war with the English was decided upon,—a step which European nations consider not unworthy of a serious discussion. Our readers will not be sorry to learn, on the best authority, how it was knocked off in China. Here is the Cabinet Minister's account of it:—

'The Emperor assembled the Eight Tchoung Tang which composed his secret council, and spoke to them of the events which had taken place in the south. He told them that the adventurers of the southern seas had become rebellious and insubordinate; that they must be taken, and severely punished, in order to be an example to those who might be tempted to imitate their conduct. Having thus shown his opinion, the Emperor asked the advice of his council. The four Mantchou Tchoung Tang prostrated themselves, saying—"Tché, tché, tché, Tchou-Dze-Ti, Fan-Fou." "Yes, yes, yes; that is the master's order." The four Chinese Tchoung-Tang prostrated themselves in their turn, and said, "Ché, ché, ché Hoang-Chang-Ti, Tien-Ngen." "Yes, yes, yes; it is the celestial benefit of the Emperor." After that, there was no more to be said, and the council was dismissed.'—Vol. ii. p. 336.

Under such countenance the missionaries prospered. They had been but a month at Lassa, '*et déjà les nombreux habitants de cette ville étaient accoutumés à parler avec respect de la sainte doctrine de Jehovah et du grand royaume de France.*' But a reverse was at hand. Suddenly their friend Ki-Chan demanded their expulsion. The Regent took their part. A characteristic argument ensued. 'If their doctrine were false,' said the Regent, following in the footsteps of Gamaliel, 'it would not prevail: if it were true, all the world were bound to adopt it.' Whether it were false or true, replied Ki-Chan, it threatened the divine authority of the Talé-Lama, whose interest he was there to protect. After some discussion, the weaker went to the wall, and the missionaries commenced their preparations for departure. This sudden disappointment is ascribed to various causes; by M. Huc to the machinations of the devil,

and Ki-Chan's dread of French influence arising in their persons; by Ki-Chan himself, alternately to his zeal for the Talé-Lama, and his intimate persuasion that any toleration of Christianity would cost him his head. It appears to us sufficiently accounted for by a little circumstance which M. Huc drops as if nothing turned upon it. They had asked the Regent's assistance in opening a communication with Calcutta. We can hardly conceive a more flagrant act of indiscretion, or one more certain to produce the results which actually followed, viz. their summary deportation through the heart of Thibet and China to Macao. However that may be, their exit being clearly determined upon, every possible indulgence was shown them in details. The Regent furnished them with letters of recommendation to all the Houtouktous on the road. Ki-Chan gave them a Chinese escort, consisting of the mandarin, Ly-Kouo-Ngan, (the Pacifier of Kingdoms,) an old worn-out debauchee, and a party of fifteen soldiers. Nay, he even requested them to charge themselves with some large boxes of valuables, which it seems he could not safely trust to any one but the Christians whom he was oppressing. But the one point was clear,—they were to go, and they did go. Their adieus to those who had learnt wholly or in part the truths of Christianity were kind and affectionate; that with the Regent significant; but the parting scene with Ki-Chan deserves to be extracted at length:

‘We entered with our conductor into Ki-Chan's apartment. The fifteen soldiers stopped at the threshold of the door, and drew up in file; after having prostrated themselves, and touched the ground thrice with their foreheads, the Pacifier of Kingdoms did the same; but the poor wretch could only rise again with our help. We saluted, as was our custom, by putting our caps under our arms. Ki-Chan began to speak, and made a little harangue to each of us.

‘Addressing himself first to us, he spoke in a wheedling and affected tone. “Here,” he said, “you are going to return to your country; I think you will not complain of me; my conduct towards you is irreproachable. I do not allow you to remain here, but that is the will of the great Emperor, not mine; I do not allow you to go to India, because the laws of the empire forbid it; if not, old as I am, I would myself accompany you to the frontier. The route that you are about to take is not so frightful as people pretend; it is true you will have a little snow; you will find some high mountains; there will be some cold days. You see I do not hide the truth from you. Why should I deceive you? But at any rate you will have men to attend upon you; you will find a lodging ready every evening; you will not be obliged to pitch your tent. Is not this road much better than the one you travelled here by? You will be obliged to ride. I cannot give you a palanquin; there are none to be found in this country. I shall send my report to the great Emperor in a few days; as my couriers travel day and night, it will precede you. When you shall arrive in peace at the capital of Tse-Tchouen, the viceroy Pao will take charge of you, and my responsibility will be over. You may depart with confidence, expanding your hearts. I have already sent orders that you should be well treated wherever you go. May a happy star guide your journey from first to last!”

"Although we feel we are oppressed," we answered, "nevertheless we wish for your prosperity. Since you aspire to honours, may you regain all you have lost, and attain yet greater!" "Oh! my star is evil, my star is evil!" cried Ki-Chan, taking a large pinch of snuff from his silver box.

Then addressing himself to the Pacifier of Kingdoms, his voice became suddenly grave and solemn. "Ly-Kouo-Ngan," he said, "since the great Emperor allows you to return to his family, you are to depart. You will have these two travelling companions, and that ought to rejoice you much; for you know the road is long and tedious. These men are full of justice and mercy; you will, therefore, live in great harmony with them. Be careful never to sadden their hearts either by word or deed. I have another important thing to tell you; as you have served the empire for twelve years on the frontiers of Ghorkha, I have ordered the treasurer to send you five hundred ounces of silver. It is a present from the great Emperor." At these words, Ly-Kouo-Ngan, finding at once an unwonted flexibility in his legs, flung himself impetuously on his knees. "The celestial benefits of the great Emperor," he said, "have always and everywhere surrounded me; but, bad servant as I am, how can I, without blushing, receive such a signal favour? I earnestly supplicate the ambassador that he will allow me to hide my face, and withdraw myself from this undeserved favour." Ki-Chan answered, "Do you think that the great Emperor will thank you for your disinterestedness? What are a few ounces of silver? There, take this little sum, since it is offered to you; you will have enough to drink a cup of tea with your friends; but when you are down there, beware of beginning again with brandy. If you desire to live a few years longer, keep yourself from brandy. I say this to you because a father and mother should give their children good advice." Ly-Kouo-Ngan struck the earth thrice with his forehead, then rose and stood beside us.

Lastly, Ki-Chan harangued the soldiers, and changed his tone for the third time. His voice was sharp, abrupt, sometimes almost angry and passionate. "And you, soldiers, there." At these words, the fifteen soldiers, as if moved by a single spring, fell at once on their knees, and remained in this attitude throughout the address. "Let us see; how many are you? fifteen, I think," and at the same time he counted them with his finger. "Yes, that is it, fifteen men. You fifteen soldiers, you are about to return to your province, your service is over; you are to escort your Tou-Sse and these two strangers to Sse-Tchouen; you must serve them faithfully on the road, and be careful to be always obedient and respectful. Do you clearly understand these words?" "Yes, we understand." "When you go through the villages of the Poba (Thibetans) woe to you if you oppress the people; beware of pillaging and taking other people's goods. Do you clearly understand?" "Yes, we understand." "Do not hurt the flocks, respect the fields in seed. Do not burn the forests. Do you clearly understand?" "Yes, we understand." "Let there always be peace and harmony between you. Are you not all soldiers of the empire? Do not, then, slander and abuse one another. Do you clearly understand?" "Yes, we understand." "Whoever behaves ill, need not think to escape punishment; his crime will be carefully examined and severely punished. Do you clearly understand?" "Yes, we understand." "Since you understand, obey and tremble!" After this short, but energetic peroration, the fifteen soldiers struck the ground thrice with their foreheads and rose up.—Vol. ii. pp. 386—389.

For some time their journey was easy enough. They travelled through the semi-civilized low country, where the influence of the Chinese Emperor was substantial, and where,

accordingly, the Pacificator of Kingdoms exacted *oulahs*,—that is to say, pressed men and horses, and billeted his people on the inhabitants at pleasure. But when they plunged into the mountains, their difficulties began. In the first place, the roads were frightful. We do not, indeed, collect that there was any danger or hardship to be encountered which many a traveller of ordinary enterprise has not faced for amusement; but our missionaries appear to have imagined themselves continually hanging between life and death. The rickety wooden bridges by which they had to scramble along precipitous cliffs, or the steep mountain sides, which hardly afforded a footing for their horses, must certainly have been trying to the nerves; but they saw destruction in them at every step—not because they were either cowards or boasters, for they are neither; but because their French imaginations on these, as on some other occasions, were a little too much for them. But another difficulty lay in the people. The hardy and warlike mountaineers felt neither love nor fear to the Emperor of China or his men, and very usually regarded them with aversion and contempt. It need hardly be said, that in such a country the demand for *oulahs* was little attended to; and, in spite of threats, complaints, and cajoleries, the Pacificator had to pay down *argent comptant*, a very full and sufficient price for every man, horse, or dish of oatmeal, that he or his escort required. On these occasions, the Lamas of the West were rather more able to aid the Mandarin than he to protect them. Their first difficulty of this kind arose in the province of Kham—part of a country which was a subject of contention between two rival Houtouktous; the one possessing the advantages of age, legitimacy, and Chinese patronage; the other, those of youth, popular favour, and, probably, impudence—for he founded his title on a grant made to him, as he declared, in one of his anterior lives, by the then Talé Lama. The following picture of the mountain chief, Proul-Tamba, tells its own story. It is only necessary to premise that he was a leading partizan of the younger and more popular claimant, a redoubtable warrior, and an eminent theologian; and, finally, that his father was the disciple of a celebrated anchorite, or contemplative Lama, who had spent twenty-two years in a mountain cave, ‘passing day and night in prayer and meditation on the ten thousand virtues of Budha.’ To this potentate the Pacificator had appealed against the exactions of his people, and he came in person to settle the dispute. He arrived with a train of four horsemen, received with something less than courtesy the cringing civilities of the Chinese, and took summarily the place of honour on a carpet of grey felt. The rest seated themselves in a respectful circle around.

There was a moment of profound silence. The great chief, Proul-Tamba, was, at most, but forty years old; he was of middle height, and his only dress was a large robe of green silk, lined with fine wolf-skin, and girt at the loins with a red band. Large violet-coloured leather boots, a frightful cap of fox's-skin, and a long and wide sabre, fastened horizontally to his girdle, completed his costume. Long, jet-black hair, which hung down upon his shoulders, gave a very energetic expression to his pale, thin countenance. The eyes were the most remarkable feature in the countenance of this man; they were large, flashing, and full of indomitable courage and pride. In all his bearing, Proul-Tamba appeared to be a very superior man, and born to command among his race. After having looked attentively at all of us, one after another, resting his hands on the two ends of his sabre, he drew out of his breast a packet of little¹ khata, and made one of his men give us each one. Then turning towards Ly-Kouo-Ngan, "Ah! here you are, back again," he said, in a voice which sounded like a bell; "if I had not heard this morning that it was you, I should not have known you again. How old you have grown, since you last passed through Bagoung!" "Yes, you are right," answered the Pacifier of Kingdoms, in a sugary voice; and dragging himself on the felt carpet, to get nearer his companion,—“Yes, you are right; I am very infirm; but as for you, you are more vigorous than ever.” “We live in times when it is necessary to be vigorous. . . . There is no longer peace in our mountains.” “True; I heard below you have had a little contest among yourselves.” “It is more than a year since the tribes of Kham have waged fierce war with each other; and do you call that a little contest? You need only keep open your eyes on your road, and you will see everywhere ruined villages and burnt forests. In a few days we shall have to set to work again, for no one will hear words of peace. This war might have ended with a few battles; but since you Chinese have meddled with our affairs, parties have become irreconcilable. Oh! you Chinese mandarins only serve to bring disorder and confusion into our country. This cannot last. We have let you have your own way for a long time, and now your audacity is boundless. I cannot, without shuddering all over, think of that affair of the Nomekhan of Lassa. They pretend that the Nomekhan committed great crimes. It is false. These great crimes are inventions of yours. The Nomekhan is a saint—a living Budha. Who ever heard tell that a living Budha could be judged and exiled by Ki-Chan, a Chinese, a black man?” “The order came from the great Emperor,” answered Ly-Kouo-Ngan, in a low and trembling voice. “Your great Emperor!” cried Proul-Tamba, turning passionately towards the speaker; “your great Emperor is nothing but a black man. What is your Emperor in comparison of a Grand Lama—of a living Budha?”

The great chief of the province of Kham inveighed for a long time against the dominion of the Chinese in Thibet. He alternately attacked the emperor, the viceroy of Sse-Tchouen, and the ambassadors of Lassa. In the midst of his energetic philippics, he continually reverted to the matter of the Nomekhan. We saw that he was greatly interested in the fate of the Grand Lama, whom he looked upon as a victim of the court of Pekin. The Pacifier of Kingdoms was careful not to oppose him; he pretended to share Proul-Tamba's feelings, and hastened to receive all his words with slight inclinations of his head. At last he ventured to drop some words about his departure, and the *oulah*. “The *oulah*!” answered Proul-Tamba, “henceforward there shall be none for the Chinese, unless they consent to pay properly for them. It is enough that we allow the Chinese to enter

¹ All polite intercourse in Thibet begins by one party presenting the other with a khata, a scarf or handkerchief, of a value proportioned to the occasion.

our country, without being also fools enough to give them the oulah gratis. However, as I have known you for a long time, there shall be an exception made in favour of your caravan. Besides, you have charge of two Lamas from the western heaven, who have been recommended to me by the first Kalon of Lassa, and who have a right to my service. Where is the Dheba of Bagoung? let him come forward." The man, who the day before had come to say to us, "No money, no oulah," presented himself; he knelt on one knee before the great chief, and respectfully stuck out his tongue¹ at him. "Let them bring the oulah instantly," cried Proul-Tamba, "and let every one do his duty!" The Thibetans who were in the court of the guard-house shouted all at once, and ran off to the neighbouring village. Proul-Tamba rose; and after having invited us to take tea at his house, which was in our road, he sprang on his horse, and returned at full gallop. The oulah soon arrived, and the caravan was organized as if by magic.—Vol. ii. pp. 467—471.

At the next village of Gaya they were still less fortunate. After an animated discussion carried on by the whole mob of the place, man, woman, and child, all shouting and gesticulating at the same time, the proceedings concluded with a general peal of laughter, and the decision of the conclave was formally communicated to the Pacificator,—*videlicet*—That the Lamas of the West and the Thibetans would have their beasts for nothing, but that the Chinese must pay to the tune of half an ounce of silver for every horse, and a quarter for every bullock.

'At this news, Ly-Kouo-Ngan collected all his strength, and began to inveigh energetically against what he called tyranny and injustice. The Chinese soldiers of the caravan who were present, betook themselves to loud cries and menaces, in order to intimidate the delegates from the national assembly of Gaya; but these maintained an attitude admirably proud and disdainful; one of them made one step forward, placed, with a kind of savage dignity, his right hand upon Ly-Kouo-Ngan's shoulder, and fastening on him for a moment his large black eyes, shaded by thick lashes, "Man of China," he said, "listen to me; dost thou think that for a dweller in the valley of Gaya there is any great difference between cutting off the head of a Chinese or of a kid? Tell your soldiers, then, not to be fierce and speak such great words. Has any one ever seen a fox scare the terrible mountain Yak? The oulah will come in a moment; if you do not take them; if you do not start to-day,—to-morrow the price will be double." The Chinese perceiving that violence would only lead to untoward results, had recourse to tricks and flattery; but all was useless. Ly Kouo-Ngan had nothing for it but to open his strong box and weigh out the required sum.'—Vol. ii. pp. 478, 499.

These little difficulties, however, did not impede their progress. A more important event was the death of their friend the Pacificator, caused partly by a life of indulgence in spirituous liquors and other forms of excess, partly by the fatigues of the journey, partly by his own stinginess in not providing himself with proper appliances. As his end approached he had many serious conversations with the missionaries, who flattered themselves that he was on the point of embracing Christianity. It

¹ This is the mode of doing obeisance in Thibet.

was impossible to speak more feelingly than he did of the uncertainty of human life, the importance of salvation, the truth of Christianity, and the obligation of embracing it. 'Il nous dit surtout cela des choses très sensées et très touchantes.' But he was prevented from pushing his admissions to any practical conclusion, partly, it would seem, by an obstinate veneration for the Great Bear, partly by a vague but unconquerable apprehension that there was some physical impossibility in embracing Christianity while an *employé* of the emperor. He proposed to become a Christian in the bosom of his family. Like a French constitution, after having been some time at the point of death, he died at a moment when nobody happened to be expecting it, and left the missionaries to take command of the party till they could deliver themselves over to the next Mandarin, by whom they were forwarded without any further events to the frontier of China, where the story leaves them. Further, we only gather that M. Huc crossed to Macao, and proceeded to France, where he was disappointed to find that the new revolutionary government declined to involve itself on his account in a war with the celestial emperor. He appears since to have returned to China in order to resume his labours in Mongol Tartary.

We now proceed to the second part of our subject, the Buddhist religion. And at this point we begin to avail ourselves of the book of Mr. Spence Hardy, a Wesleyan missionary in Ceylon. This gentleman has apparently a far greater knowledge of books, but far less of persons and countries than M. Huc. The arrangement of his book is bad, being too much influenced by the object with which he writes it; but it is very curious, very laborious, and is crowded with extracts from original sources which can hardly fail to be valuable. 'A residence,' he says, 'of twenty years in Ceylon, and several thousands of hours spent with the palm leaf in my hand, and the ex-priest of Budha at my side to assist me in cases of difficulty, entitle me to claim attention to my translations as a faithful transcript of the original documents.'

The Buddhist religion would be a matter of grave interest to the Christian from the mere fact already mentioned, that it professes to be the religion of 360 millions of our fellow-creatures. But it is also a very wonderful structure in itself, almost equally so in its truth and in its falsehood, in its doctrines and its practical development. But the attention of a Christian is at once and more peculiarly arrested by the strange reflections of Christianity on which he falls—now in the theological outlines of Budhism; now in the spirit, or even letter, of its moral precepts; now in its legends or hagiology; now in its ecclesiastical organization; now in the minute details of its

ceremonial. Much it has in common with the Christianity of the Bible, much with that of the early ages; but when we compare it with the Christianity of modern or mediæval Rome, we are involved in a multitude of detailed and diversified analogies, not less in spirit and tone of thought than in dress and externals, which is perfectly startling. This similarity is not a matter of controversy; it is one of those obvious facts which strike a casual observer, and grow upon examination. A chance visitor of a Buddhist lamaserie (if our readers happen to have met with such) at once observes its analogy to a Roman convent. Schlegel, as a philosophic historian, stigmatizes the Buddhist hierarchy as a diabolical caricature of the Catholic Church. M. Huc, as an inquiring traveller, records with a gratified wonder, and attempts to account for, the flood of coincidences among which he finds himself. Lamas themselves declare, on receiving his explanations of Christianity, that the two religions are almost identical. And Mr. Spence Hardy exhibits in most elaborate detail, and from an opposite aspect, the analogy between Eastern and Western Monachism. In the following sketch of Buddhism we shall endeavour first to illustrate this parallel—perhaps to a Christian its most astonishing feature, and more incidentally to touch on its political bearing on the state of the Chinese empire.

We begin with theology; by which we mean those great truths respecting the nature of the Godhead, the relations in which He has placed Himself to His creatures, and the destiny which He has assigned to them, which lie at the bottom of all religion. We have already slightly touched on this point. We have seen that, while the Chief Kalon at Lassa professed that his religion contained the great truths of Christianity, (at least, those which his teacher thought it expedient to disclose to him,) M. Huc, on the contrary, was convinced that the Buddhist theology issued in nothing more than a vast pantheism. The same impression is brought out more clearly in the following account of a conversation which took place at an earlier period of his travels:—

‘In the Blue City, as at Tolon Noor, every one repeated to us that the doctrine would appear more sublime and luminous as we travelled towards the west. According to Lamas who had visited Thibet, Lassa was a great centre of light, of which the rays became continually weaker as they receded from their source.

‘One day we had an opportunity of conversing for some time with a Thibetan Lama; what he told us on points of religion threw us into the greatest astonishment. A short explanation of the Christian doctrine which we gave him, seemed to surprise him little; he even contended that our words did not greatly differ from the belief of the Grand Lamas of Thibet. “You must not confound,” he said, “religious truth with the numerous superstitions which excite the credulity of the ignorant. The

Tartars are simple; they prostrate themselves before whatever they meet; all is *Borhan* to their eyes. The Lamas, the books of prayer, the temples, the houses in the lamaserie, even the stones, and the bones that they heap up upon the mountains, they put all in the same rank; at every step they prostrate themselves on the ground, put their clasped hands on their foreheads and cry, *Borhan, Borhan.* "But do not the Lamas also allow innumerable Borhans?" "That requires explanation," he said, smiling; "*there is but one single sovereign who has created all things; he has neither beginning nor end.* In Dchagar (India) he is called Budha, and in Thibet, Samtchè-Mitchèba (Eternal Almighty); the Chinese call him Fo, and the Tartars, Borhan." "You say that Budha is one; what, then, are the Talè-Lama of Lassa, the Bandchan of Djachi-Loumbo, the Tsong-Kaba of the Sifan, the Kaldan of Tolon Noor, the Guison-Tamba of Grand Kouren, the Hobilgan of the Blue Town, the Hotoktou of Pekin, and all those numerous Chabérons living in the lamaserie of Tartary and Thibet?" "All are equally Budha." "Is Budha visible?" "No, he is without a body; he is a spiritual being." "Therefore Budha is one; and yet there are innumerable Budhas, such as the Chabérons and others. Budha is incorporeal, we cannot see him, and yet the Talè-Lama, the Guison-Tamba, and the rest, are visible and have a body like ours. How can you explain that?" "This doctrine," he said, extending his arms, and assuming a remarkable tone of authority,—"*this doctrine is true; it is the doctrine of the West; but it is of unfathomable depth; it cannot be fully explained.*"

"The words of the Thibetan Lama were a strange surprise to us. The unity of God, the mystery of the Incarnation, the dogma of the Real Presence, appeared to us as it were concealed in his belief; *yet with ideas so just in appearance, he admitted the metempsychosis, and a sort of pantheism of which he could give no real account.*

"These new views of the religion of Budha made us augur that we should really find, among the Lamas of Thibet, a creed more pure and high than that of the vulgar. We persisted in our resolution of pushing on towards the west."—Vol. i. pp. 194—196.

'There is,' says the priest, 'but one single sovereign, who has created all things. He has neither beginning nor end.' And it is evident that to this sovereign not only the devout and uninstructed vulgar, but the learned Lamas, address themselves in order to obtain from him that which they want. 'Budha is the master of life and death,' says a priest to M. Huc; 'it is proper that we should pray to him to deliver us from disease.' 'Budha has given us the knowledge of medicines,' and everything else that is good. The main test which M. Huc applies to the religion of the Tartars, and on the strength of which he acknowledges their claim to be a religious people, is that they are 'men of prayer.' But, if we are to understand 'pantheism' in its natural sense—the denial of the Divine Personality, and the substitution of a mechanical agency for a Supreme Will—it is difficult to reconcile it with the more living creed which is involved in this practical religion of the Tartars. The natural explanation would seem to be, that both the vulgar and the learned do believe themselves practically to be under the government of such a supreme will, of which the

special residence is not on earth, but which embodies itself in the persons of their living Budhas or Chabérons; yet that, notwithstanding this belief, thoughtful persons are entangled in certain philosophical conceptions from which pantheism is the logical consequence. But the documentary theology of Buddhism, according to Mr. Spence Hardy's account of it, is more unequivocally bad. It is too little to call it pantheism; it occasionally approaches atheism, and is in fact so called by Mr. Spence Hardy.

In Buddhist theology, according to him (p. 5), there is no Creator, no Being that is self-existent and eternal. The Source of all things is not either spirit or matter, but *karma*, or action, of which all sentient beings are homogeneous developments. The only material difference between them is that of the merit or demerit which is accumulated by each soul (or, rather, by the 'karma' which that soul represents) during the countless phases of existence through which it passes. Demerit is punished by a penal transmigration, merit rewarded by a happy one. The vicious being finds himself born after death into the state of a toad or polypus, perhaps even in hell, a place of frightful and indefinite, though not endless suffering. He, on the contrary, who has satisfied the precepts of religion, is rewarded by a birth among the *dewas*, or *Brahma-lokas*, who dwell above the Mahameru, a mountain in the centre of the earth. Higher even than these angelic beings is the state of a *rahat*, a man in whom the eradication of all evil desire is rewarded by supernatural knowledge, and power of the wildest and most eccentric kind. But the highest state of existence is that of the Budhas—divine beings, who appear at immense intervals of time, with miraculous if not infinite powers, and charged with the office of teaching man the way of salvation. This state is the reward of those alone who, through myriads of ages and countless lives, have steadily kept it before them as the object of their successive existences.

But beyond all these states of existence is something higher still—*nirvāna*, or non-existence. What this is, it is difficult to make out. Sometimes it appears to be a kind of absorption into a kind of divinity, sometimes it appears to be a mere cessation of being. Mr. Spence Hardy gives some curious arguments on the subject between orthodox teachers and objecting learners. They are very subtle and precise, full of illustration, and, at first sight, promising a very definite conclusion; but the end is, that the orthodox believer slips through your fingers. On the one hand, *nirvāna* appears to be, and to be a sensation. 'Great king,' says the sage Nagasena to the King of Sagal, '*nirvāna* is. It is a perception of the mind. The pure, de-

‘lightful, *nirwána*, free from ignorance and evil desire, is perceived by the *rahats* who enjoy the fruition of the paths? Again, it is ‘free from danger, safe, without fear, *happy*, peaceful, the source of enjoyment, refreshing.’ On the other hand, it is neither created nor uncreated, it is neither past, present, nor future; it is nowhere, except in them who attain it, and though brought into existence by attainment, is without cause. It cannot be described ‘by sign, locality, length, manner, metaphor, cause, or order.’ It can only be understood by the sight of those who have attained it. Such persons appear to be visible, yet *nirwána* is the cessation of ‘successive’—much more of visible existence, and even (in Mr. Spence Hardy’s view) of existence itself. ‘It is filled with the perfume of emancipation’ from existence, as the surface of the sea is covered by flower-‘resembling waves.’

‘The man who sees a bar of iron that has been heated to the highest possible degree can discover no way whatever in which it will be desirable to hold it; and it is the same with him who contemplates the evils of successive existence; he can see no form whatever in which it is to be desired. Like a fish caught in a net; like a frog when attracted to the mouth of a serpent; like a bird in the claws of a cat; like a nayá in the beak of a garunda; like the moon in the mouth of Ráhu; he struggles to obtain release from existence.’—*Eastern Monachism*, p. 299.

A melancholy moral indeed—beautifully versified by our own Spenser—not, however, as the voice of religion, but among the subtle promptings of the miscreant ‘*Despair*.’

‘What if some little payne the passage have
That makes frayle flesh to feare the bitter wave;
Is not short payne well borne, that brings long ease,
And lays the soule to sleepe in quiet grave?
Sleepe after toyle, port after stormie seas,
Ease after warre, death after life doth greatly please.

* * * * *

Then doe no further goe, no further stray;
But here ly downe and to thy rest betake,
Th’ ill to prevent, that life ensewen may.
For what hath life, that may it loved make,
And gives not rather cause it to forsake?
Feare, sicknesse, age, losse, labour, sorrow, strife,
Payne, hunger, cold that makes the heart to quake;
And ever fickle fortune rageth rife;
All which and thousands mo, do make a loathsome life.’

Nor is it less puzzling, even to the docile King of Sagal, than it is melancholy. ‘Venerable sir,’ he says, ‘you told me that ‘Budha has declared that the fourth path is the cause of the accomplishment of *nirwána*, and yet you say also that *nirwána* is ‘without a cause. I am confounded: I go from darkness into ‘deeper darkness. I am in a forest: I go from an entangled

'thicket into a thicket more entangled. If there is a cause for the attributes or accompaniments of nirwána, there must also be a cause for the production of nirwána. The son must have a father: that father must have had another father.' And so he proceeds in a state of much perplexity. The unbelievers too, or *tirttakas*, pushed him to unpleasant conclusions respecting the bearing of this doctrine on the nature of God; suggesting a series of questions and difficulties which curiously illustrate what is sometimes called the 'theosophy' of Buddhism, and exhibit in an oriental form the mystery equally beyond the grasp of Eastern or Western, of the child or of the philosopher—the mystery which requires us to believe that the unchangeableness of the Deity is not irreconcilable with the efficacy of prayer.

"The tirttaka unbelievers," says King Milinda, "argue in this manner:—If Budha now receives the offerings of men, he has not attained nirwána, as in that state all cleaving to existing objects is destroyed; he is still connected with the world; he is yet existent; he is in the world, and has the same attributes as other beings; therefore the assistance that he can render is imperfect, vain, and worthless. But if he has attained nirwána, he is not connected with the world; he is not existent; he cannot receive the offerings that are made to him; there is therefore no benefit from presenting them, as he has no life, no being, aprána. None but a rahat can answer this argument of the tirttakas; therefore be pleased, venerable priest, to set aside this difficulty." Nágásena replied, "Budha has attained nirwána, in which there is no cleaving to existence; he does not receive the offerings that are presented; . . . nevertheless, those who make offerings to the relics of the Budhas, or listen to their bana, will receive the three great favours, viz. the happiness of this world, of the déwa-lokas, and of nirwána. . . . This benefit is gained, though Budha does not receive the offerings. Budha foresaw the things that would happen in future times, and he said to Ananda, 'Ananda, when I am gone, you must not think that there is no Budha; the discourses I have delivered, and the precepts I have enjoined, must be my successors, or representatives, and be to you as Budha.' Therefore, the declaration of the tirttakas that there is now no benefit from the presenting of offerings to Budha is utterly false; though he does not receive them, the benefit to the giver is the same as if he did. Again, does the earth say, 'Let such and such trees grow upon my surface?' Milinda: "No." Nágásena: "Then how is it that flowers, and buds, and shrubs, and trees, and creepers passing from one to the other, are produced?" Milinda: "The earth, though itself unconscious, is the cause of their production." Nágásena: "Even so, though Budha is now unconscious, he is nevertheless the source of benefit to those who seek his protection. That which is the opposite of evil desire, enmity, and ignorance, is thus like the root of merit set in the ground; the exercise of samádhi is like the trunk of the tree; the doctrines of the bana are like the hard wood in its heart; the four sangwara precepts are like the boughs and main branches; the five forms of knowledge called wimukti, that reveal the way in which emancipation is to be obtained, are like the colours and perfume of the flowers; and the fruition of the paths leading to nirwána is like the immortal fruit; and all this is brought about by Budha, though he has attained nirwána, and is unconscious. . . . Again, did you never hear of the yaká Nandaka, who struck the head of Seriyut with his hand, and the earth clove, and he went down to hell? Was this cleaving of

the earth brought about by the will and appointment of Seriyut?" Milinda: "No; this could not be; the world and all the beings that inhabit it might pass away; the sun and moon might fall to the earth, and Maha Méru be destroyed; but Seriyut could not will the endurance of sorrow by any being whatever; the rising of anger would at once be overcome by the virtue he possessed as a *rahat*; he could not be incensed even against his murderer. It was by the power of his own demerit that Nandaka was sent to hell." Nágaséna: "It was even so; but if this demerit, though unconscious, could cause the *yaká* to be taken to hell, so may merit, though also unconscious, cause those who possess it to be taken to a *déwa-loka*, and receive happiness. Thus, O king, when the *tirtakas* say, 'If Budha receives the offerings of men, he is yet in the world of sentient being; but if he has attained *nirwána*, he is unconscious, he cannot assist those who seek his protection; and there is therefore no benefit to be derived from the offerings that are made to him;' their argument is of no value, it is vain and deceitful." In this way the venerable priest answered the questions of the great king; like the man who shakes the branches of the *jambu* tree fifty *yojanas* in height, and succeeds in procuring its immortal fruit.'—*Ibid.* pp. 228—232.

In all this it is not always easy to say whether the kings and sages are dealing with things or with mere words, nor to reconcile M. Huc with Mr. Spence Hardy, nor the somewhat conflicting expressions of Buddhist authorities with each other. Thus much, however, is clear, that Budha is the supreme object of worship, and *nirwána* the Supreme Good—the legitimate object of religious thought and action, and the state into which Budhas, *rahats*, and generally all who have accumulated the requisite amount of merit, are finally absorbed.

The great objects of religious worship and veneration appear to be what are called the 'Three Gems': Budha, the Truth, and the Associated Priesthood, under whose protection the novice is placed on entering a religious life, and on whose perfections he is bidden to meditate.

'I take refuge in Budha;'

'I take refuge in the Truth;'

'I take refuge in the Associated Priesthood;'

is the 'threefold protective formula' which appears almost to answer to the baptismal creed of the Christian.

Dharmma, or the Truth, is of course the whole Buddhist system, formed round the original revelation of Gótama Budha, by an accretion of devotional and practical books, of various authority, and of definitive decisions issued *pro re natá*, as circumstances called them forth. The Associated Priesthood, as the name implies, are the body of Lamas, who are the depositaries and teachers of the truth, and to whom it would appear to be almost exclusively addressed.

It will be seen that in the system, as thus explained by Mr. Spence Hardy, the continual incarnations of the Deity, which form so prominent a feature in Tartar and Thibetan religion, in fact disappear. It is not that God approaches man, but that

some men raise themselves for a moment above their species, and then disappear—merged in the vast nothing upon which this form of Buddhism appears to concentrate itself. These men are the divine founders of systems or dispensations—they are charged with the exalted office (in Mr. Spence Hardy's words) 'of directing sentient beings to the path which leads to *nirvāna*,' but they are no more—they come and go, and are not.

The Budha to whom the present dispensation is due, and to whom it is referred as the centre of its faith and worship, was Gótama Budha, who was born about 2,500 years ago, in a country near Nepaul, of which his father was king. Mr. Spence Hardy gives a summary of his life. His childhood was wondrous. 'At the moment of his birth he stepped upon the ground, and after looking around towards the four quarters, 'the four half quarters, above and below, without seeing any one in these ten directions who was equal to himself, he exclaimed, "I am the most exalted in the world; this is my last birth; hereafter there is to me no other existence."' He sat in the air when five months old, without any support; and his person bore the marks which betokened a supreme Budha. But although in previous lives innumerable, animal, human, and divine, he had set the office of Budha before him as the object of his ambition, and had continually disciplined himself for its reception, it was still necessary that this, his last human life, should be spent as a hermit. Cræsus-like, his father had been warned that to this life he would be led by the sight of four signs,—decrepitude, sickness, a dead body, and a recluse. Cræsus-like, he tried to avert them, but in vain. Each in their turn, they appeared: the loathsomeness of the three first taught Gótama to despise the world—the calm expression of the holy man's countenance taught him how to conquer it. The thought of an ascetic life fastened on his mind; and while he was meditating disturbedly on its excellences, his intentions were brought to a point by disgust at the disordered appearance and unseemly postures of his singing girls; who, failing to fix his attention by their music, had fallen asleep around him. After a look at his newly-born and only son, who was sleeping in the arms of his mother, he abandoned his palace and the world, for the forest of Uruwela. There he remained six years, passing through a course of continually increasing austerity, till his daily allowance of food was reduced to no more than a pepper pod. His body became greatly attenuated, and one night he fell senseless to the ground, from exhaustion. Before long, after withstanding a tremendous onset from a formidable host of demons, 'under a 'Bò tree, near which Budha Gaya was afterwards built, he 'received the supreme Budhaship.'

' At the tenth hour of the same night, he attained the wisdom by which he knew the exact circumstances of all the beings that have ever existed in the infinite worlds; at the twentieth hour he received the divine eyes, by which he had the power to see all things within the space of the infinite systems of worlds as clearly as if they were close at hand; and at the tenth hour of the following morning, or the close of the third watch of the night, he attained the knowledge by which he was enabled to understand the sequence of existence, the cause of all sorrow and its cessation. The object of his protracted toils and numerous sacrifices, carried on incessantly through myriads of ages, was now accomplished. By having become a Budha he had received a power by which he could perform any act whatever, and a wisdom by which he could see perfectly any object, or understand any truth, to which he chose to direct his attention.'—*Ibid.* p. 4.

He announced himself the teacher of the three worlds, wiser than the wisest, higher than the highest. He worked miracles; he preached to heavenly beings, and visited heavenly worlds; he endued thousands of his disciples with the power of suspending the laws of heaven and earth; and, finally, died at the age of eighty. From that time he has attained *nirwāna*, and is no more. His tooth is in possession of the British Government at Kandy—the impression of his foot is on Adam's peak—his collar-bone is somewhere else. But his soul is nowhere; and we have seen that his disciples are left in the difficulty of having to explain in what sense he is now non-existent, and if non-existent, how he can still be a legitimate object of worship.

Even in this fantastic picture we can trace the same distorted likeness to Christianity which a dream bears to reality. In the person of Budha we see an unavailing struggle to reconcile the ideas of a spiritual and an incarnate God. We see in the holy Triad, Budha, the Truth, and the Associated Priesthood, a reflection of that Trinity which Christians worship—the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth—the Word and Wisdom of the Father,—and the Comforter, who inhabits the Church of Christ. We find a probation, a heaven, and a hell. But the likeness crumbles as we look upon it. As in the physical world, some gases, unless carefully purified from all foreign matter, and mixed with a scrupulous observance of time, proportion, and temperature, refuse to enter into the proper combination, and issue either in a coarse mechanical amalgamation, or some offensive chemical incongruity; so, in Budhism, the great elements of religious truth, jumbled up as it were with the prevailing doctrine of metempsychosis, and devoid of any clear apprehension of the Divine Personality, result not in a harmonious whole, but in a wild mixture of subtlety and grotesqueness, grandeur and littleness, precision and inconsistency. The idea of a spiritual Godhead melts into a metaphysical abstraction, while that of the Incarnation is swollen into creature-worship. The expressions which remind a Christian of the Holy Trinity

dwindle and dry up into a creature, a book, and an ecclesiastical polity, and it is not very easy to be sure that the final reward of human holiness, *nirvāṇa*, has any existence at all.

It follows to examine the imposing superstructure which in the course of centuries the subtlety and grandeur of oriental enthusiasm have erected on this narrow and delusive basis.

We take first the morality of this religion,—wonderful in itself, more wonderful in its analogy to Christianity, which here becomes more deep and substantial. It seems as if the minds which must have been continually working on this system, baffled in their attempts to reach God, had repaid themselves by the searching minuteness with which they had questioned physical nature and their own minds. This perhaps we should expect from Pantheism, which while it lowers the Deity from a supreme governor to an animating principle, brings out to exaggeration the truth that 'in Him we live, and move, and have our being,' considering the growth of a rush, though less magnificently, yet not less absolutely divine than the miracle of a saint, or the teaching of a Budha. Their moral system is the result of these questionings. It is full of trifling minuteness and unmeaning ceremonial, but its precepts do yet go firmly and searchingly to the bottom of morality. Abandonment of self, charity to our fellow-creatures, and subjugation not of the body only, but of the mind, are the foundation of the grotesque and heterogeneous superstructure.

This we shall proceed to illustrate. But we must first observe that the elaborate moral and ceremonial system propounded by Buddhist authorities appears directly applicable to priests only. The great virtue prescribed to the layman, or 'householder,' as he is called, in contradistinction to the unmarried and mendicant priest, seems to be almsgiving; the merit of which varies, not only with the necessities, merits, and motives of the giver, but with the worthiness of the receiver:—

'A hunter once gave alms to one who did not observe the precepts, in order to benefit his brother who was a *prêta* sprite,' (suffering, *i.e.* a kind of purgatory,) 'but he derived no benefit therefrom. The hunter then gave alms to one who did observe the precepts, and his brother was released from the *prêta*-birth.'—*Ibid.* p. 83.

The most trifling offering to a priest, or saint, if properly given, is followed by the most stupendous rewards; and some of the promises made to such gifts are of the coarse and extravagant kind by which a greedy priesthood is wont, and unhappily even a Christian priesthood has sometimes ventured, to raise money. Sometimes, however, this virtue is enforced by teaching of a more refined cast. The virtue of alms, we are told, is extinguished when they are given without thought or affection, or by

the hand of another, or are thrown to the receiver disdainfully, or given only after long intervals, or without any hope of a (providential or religious) reward. There is no reward for giving intoxicating liquors, or to indecent dancers or singers, or (more questionably) to tirttaka heretics. On the other hand, alms arising from personal labour are peculiarly meritorious, insomuch that great kings have laboured with their hands that they might give the produce to priests.

'In the time of Dīpankara Budha, Gótama Bódhisat was a rich man in Benares, who gave alms in such abundance that the whole of Jambudwīpa was as if "all the ploughs had been hung up:" all persons ceased from labour. When Sekra saw this he became alarmed, (thinking that the merit of the rich man would be so great as to entitle him to receive the office he himself then held as ruler of a celestial world) and destroyed all his remaining substance, except a sickle, a cord, and a yoke. With these Bódhisat went to cut grass, resolving to give half his earnings to the poor; but when he saw so many in destitute circumstances he gave away the whole, and his wife and he had nothing to eat for the space of six days. At last he fainted away, when in the act of cutting grass. At this moment Sekra appeared to him, and offered to return him all his substance if he would cease to give alms; but he refused to make a promise to this effect. However, as Sekra now found out that he did not do this to obtain his throne in Tawutisá, he became propitious to him, and gave him an immensity of wealth.—*Ibid.* pp. 88, 89.

The greatest gift which a householder can give to the service of religion is, of course, himself. Indeed, we find from Mr. Spence Hardy, that although it is possible to pass from the state of 'householder' to that of *nirwána*, yet this cannot be unless the man has, in some previous existence, performed the priestly duties. The next gift in value is that of a child. We find that Budha, while on earth, refused to recognise as entire votaries of his own, men who had not devoted one of their offspring to the priesthood, and we shall see that the practice among the Tartars is, in this respect, in more than accordance with the ancient requirements of their religion.

But to proceed to the priesthood. We begin by quoting the 'ten obligations' which the novice is to fix in his mind before admission to the priesthood. One might imagine them put together by a person who had half-forgotten the Ten Commandments. We should point out that 'life' includes every form of animal life, which is almost equally sacred to the priest, and that the third injunction is not of chastity but celibacy.

'1. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the taking of life.

'2. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the taking of that which has not been given.

'3. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids sexual intercourse.

' 4. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the saying of that which is not true.

' 5. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the use of intoxicating drinks, that lead to indifference towards religion.

' 6. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the eating of food after mid-day.

' 7. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids attendance upon dancing, singing, music, and masks.

' 8. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the adorning of the body with flowers, and the use of perfumes and unguents.

' 9. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the use of high or honourable seats or couches.

' 10. I will observe the precept, or ordinance, that forbids the receiving of gold or silver.'—*Ibid.* p. 24.

Nor is a mere external submission sufficient. The following passage, in which our readers will remark the curious exuberance of illustration with which the Budhist treatises are overlaid, shows also the nature of the obedience which they require.

' The precepts must be obeyed from a pure motive. Were any one to practise the Ten Obligations merely "to fill the belly," this man, deceiving the laity, greedy of fame, destitute of virtue, and unworthy to enjoy the privileges of the priesthood, will receive a double punishment; after death he will be born in the Awichi hell, where he will have to reside myriads of years, in the midst of flames, hot, fierce, and overpowering, in which he will be turned upside down, and in every possible direction, covered with foam. When released from this hell, he will be born in the hell of sprites, where he will have a body extremely attenuated, and most loathsome in its appearance, whilst he will have to endure the severest privations, and will have to walk upon earth in misery, the spectre of a priest. Just as when a man of ignoble appearance and inferior family, by some deception succeeds in being anointed king: but he is afterwards punished: his arms, legs, nose, and ears are cut off; the scalp is torn away, and boiling gruel poured on his head; his skull is rubbed with gravel until it is white as a sea-shell; a lighted brand being put in his mouth, his body is rubbed with oil and set on fire; his frame is hacked; he is thrown down, and a spike being driven from ear to ear, he is pinned to the ground; his flesh is torn with hooks, and cut with small pieces of metal like coins; the body is transfixed to the ground, and turned round and round by the legs, the pin serving as a pivot; he is flogged until his body is of the consistence of a wisp of straw; he is eaten by hungry dogs; his tongue is fastened to a stake, and he remains there until he dies; or he is beheaded. By these terrible allusions the novice is warned against becoming a recluse merely that he may secure a livelihood; and they may be received as illustrative of the modes of punishment then used.'—*Ibid.* pp. 32, 33.

Sometimes, however, their precepts have a condensed simplicity at once deeply practical and philosophical, which remind us of the keen and searching aphorisms of Thomas à Kempis. The following, for example, are quoted by Mr. Spence Hardy from a book called the 'Footsteps of Budha,'—in its very title a curious parallel to the 'Imitation of Christ.' The concluding passages invite a comparison with the words with which our Saviour concludes the Sermon on the Mount.

'Mind precedes action. The motive is chief: actions proceed from mind. If any one speak or act from a corrupt mind, suffering will follow the action as the wheel follows the lifted foot of the ox.

'Mind precedes action. The motive is chief: actions proceed from mind. If any one speak or act with a pure intention, enjoyment will follow the action, as the shadow attends the substance.

'Their anger is not subdued who recal to mind—he abused me, he struck me, he conquered me, he plundered me.

'But their anger is subdued who do not recal to mind—he abused me, he struck me, he conquered me, he plundered me.

'Anger will never be appeased by anger, but by gentleness. This is the doctrine of the ancients.

'Persons do not reflect, We shall speedily die; if any do thus reflect, their quarrels speedily terminate.

'He who lives regarding the pleasures of existence with unrestrained passions, immoderate in food, indolent, unpersevering, Mārāya (lust) will certainly subdue him, as the feeble tree is overturned by the blast.

'He who lives meditating on the evils of existence with restrained passions, temperate in food, religious, and persevering, Mārāya will certainly not overpower him, as the solid rock stands unmoved by the storm. . . .

'The worldly-minded man, who understands much of religion, and talks much concerning it, without keeping its precepts, is like a herdsman of other men's cattle, who is not partaker of the flock he tends.

'The pious man, who though he understands but little, and talks but little of religion, is an observer of its precepts; who removes lust, wrath, and folly far from him; who is considerate, possessed of a mind free from evil, and without attachments; he, in this world and that to come, is partaker of the fruits of piety.'—*Ibid.* pp. 28—30.

In the following passage, quoted by M. Huc from 'The forty-two precepts put forth by Budha,' we have exhibited, not without a certain imaginative grandeur, the one pervading thought of a religious mind—the nothingness of human life:—

'Budha asked of the *S'rāmanas*, How long is the life of man? They answered, It is but a few days. Budha said, You have not yet acquired knowledge of the doctrine.

'Then he turned to a *S'rāmana*, and asked, How long is the life of man? He answered, It is but time enough to take a meal. Budha said, Go, neither hast thou acquired knowledge of the doctrine.

'Then he turned to another *S'rāmana*, and asked, How long is the life of man? He answered, It is but time enough to draw a breath. When he had thus spoken, Budha said, It is well. Thou perhaps hast acquired knowledge of the doctrine.'—*Huc*, vol. ii. p. 152.

But how far short of that plaintive solemnity with which that same truth is proclaimed in Scripture; in words which are almost music to the eye, and seem, as it were, to appropriate for the expression of religious truth, at once the touching pathos of the Greek poet, and the majestic figures and sententious depth of the oriental sage!

'The voice said Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof as the flower of the field: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth: because the spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.'—*Is.* xl. 6—8.

In another passage from the same work we almost seem to recognise a human imitation, dry, indeed, and skeleton-like, but still terse and searching, of the solemn and pregnant sentences of Solomon:—

‘Budha, the supreme of beings, manifesting his doctrine, pronounced these words:—There are twenty difficult things under heaven. 1. Being poor and in need to confer benefits is difficult. 2. Being rich and high in rank to study doctrine is difficult. . . . 6. To dally with pleasure and to wish deliverance from our passions is difficult. 7. To see what is lovely and not to desire it is difficult. 8. Not to be drawn to what is lucrative and honourable is difficult. 9. To be reviled and not to be irritated is difficult. 10. In the bustle of affairs to conduct ourselves with calm is difficult. 11. To study much and to the bottom is difficult. 12. Not to despise an unlearned man is difficult. 13. To extirpate pride of heart is difficult. . . . 18. To persuade men to follow their conscience is difficult. 19. To keep the heart in an even movement is difficult. 20. Not to slander is difficult.’—*Hue*, vol. ii. p. 149.

Every reader must be struck by the weighty (may we not say scriptural?) simplicity of this morality. But at this point the Buddhist doctrines do not stop. Their views of celibacy, asceticism, and the contemplative life are singularly coincident with what we find in the later history of the Church. The true priest must extirpate from his heart all attachment to, all pleasure in, all observation of things earthly:—

‘The priest is not to eat as a pastime, nor for pleasure, nor to make the body strong like the public wrestlers, nor to render it beautiful like the dancers. As a man with a falling house props it up—as a man with a broken wagon puts in a piece of wood, so may the priest eat to preserve his body, and prevent untimely death. As hunger is the most powerful of all the appetites, he may eat to ward it off.’—*Eastern Monachism*, p. 96.

But he must eat, if possible, with disgust, as a man would eat the flesh of his child to save his life. So the professional poverty, the contempt of domestic duties in comparison of the ascetic life—the exaggerated horror of woman, as if her very touch was pollution—the minuteness of observance—the subjection to precise and formal rules—the prolonged meditation suspending all other duties—and all the feats, or, as we must sometimes call them, pranks of asceticism, which we find in later Christianity, find their parallels, if not their caricatures, in Buddhism. It is perhaps in Buddhist hagiology that the most curious coincidences spring up. The following passage, for example, from the legend of Rathapála, with all its wild orientalism, will remind the reader of monastic legends of many similar incidents in the career of Romanist saints:—

‘When Gótama Budha visited the different places in the province of Kuru, that he might confer benefits upon the people, he came to the brahman village of Thullakotthitan, so called on account of the numerous castles it contained, that were filled with all kinds of treasures. The people of the

village had embraced the doctrines of Budha. Among the rest there was a brahman of a respectable family called Rathapála, who came to Gótama when he visited the village, and requested that he might be admitted to the priesthood, as he said that it was difficult for him to act aright so long as he continued a laic. Budha inquired if his parents had given their consent, and when Rathapála said that he had not requested their permission, the sage made known to him that it was not his custom to receive any into the priesthood who had not gained the consent of their parents. The brahman then went to his parents, and told them that since he had heard the discourses of Budha it was his wish to become a priest; and he now requested their permission to carry this wish into effect. But his parents replied, "You are our beloved son—our only son; we have none older than you, none younger; you have lived in all happiness; you have enjoyed yourself; you know nothing of sorrow; remain contented; eat and drink whatever is cherishing or delicious; take to yourself a retinue of beautiful maidens; have dancing girls to amuse you; remain a householder; and gain merit by giving alms to the three gems. We cannot give you permission to embrace the priesthood; we do not wish you to become a priest even after we are dead, and cannot, therefore, give our consent whilst we are alive." Rathapála then said, "Unless I receive your permission, I will die here;" and having said this, he lay down upon the bare ground. The parents repeated their former declarations three several times, and entreated him to rise; but as he still continued silent, they went to some of his friends, informed them of the determination of their son, and asked them to come and try to persuade him to change it. The friends accordingly came to the place where he was, and thrice urged the same reasons as his parents to induce him to remain a laic; but he still remained silent. They then went to his parents, and telling them it was in vain to attempt to alter his resolution, said it would be better to give their consent; they would then be able to see him at intervals; but if they still refused their permission, he would die. To this advice they agreed, on condition that the person who ordained him would allow him to pay them a visit from time to time. When the friends informed Rathapála that his parents gave their consent, he arose, took some refreshment, and went to the residence of Budha, who admitted him to the priesthood on learning that his parents had granted their permission.

Not long after Rathapála had thus renounced the world, he attained rahatship, and became, indeed, one of the chief of the rahats; after which he went to Budha, who was now resident at Rajagaha, and requested permission to go and see his parents according to the promise he had given. As his request was granted, he went to his native village, near which he remained in a garden called Migachíra, belonging to the king Kórawya. At the proper time, taking his alms-bowl, he went to the village to receive alms, after putting on his robe in such a way as to conceal his person. As he approached his own residence, in going regularly from house to house, his father was standing in the central door-way of the mansion, which had in all seven doors. When his father saw him in the distance he said, "This is one of the priests who took away from us our only and beloved son." No attentions were paid to him by any of the family; nor were any alms presented; abuse was all that he received. At that time the female slave of one of his relatives was taking some food made of barley, which had been boiled the previous night and become stale, in order to throw it away. When Rathapála perceived her intention, he told her it would be better to put it in his bowl. She accordingly did so; but when he held out his bowl to receive it, she had the opportunity of seeing his hands and feet, and from this, as well as from his voice, she knew that it was Rathapála. At once she went and informed his mother, who was overjoyed at receiving this

intelligence, and promised the slave that if it were true she should receive her freedom. The mother went and imparted the news to his father; and in the mean time Rathapála eat the stale food he had received. The father went to the place whither he had retired, and said to him, "Would it not be better to come and reside at your own house, than to eat food that has become stale?" Rathapála replied, "Householder, the priests are houseless; we do not reside in houses; I have already been to your house; no alms were given me; not even a kind word did I receive." The father again entreated his son to return; but he said it was needless, as he had already partaken of food. He was then invited to come on the following day; and though he remained silent, his father knew his intention. The mansion was fitted up for his reception in the most splendid manner, and the wife of Rathapála was commanded to put on her most beautiful ornaments.

The next day, Rathapála was informed that all was ready, and he went to his former dwelling. His father displayed before him all his wealth, and said to him, "This is the property of your mother; this belongs to your father; the rest was inherited from our ancestors. Illustrious Rathapála, take possession of all this, become a laic once more, and gain merit by the giving of alms." But he replied, "If my advice were followed, all this gold, and all these jewels, and this wealth, would be placed upon wagons, taken to the Ganges or the Yamuna, and thrown into the stream: for they cause only sorrow, lamentation, grief, distress, and disappointment." His wife then held him by the feet and said, "Have you abandoned the world for the sake of some celestial nymph? If so, tell me, what is the manner of her appearance?" He replied, "Yes; it is for the sake of a celestial nymph that I have abandoned the world." On hearing this she fell down in a fit, from the excess of her grief.¹ Rathapála then said to his father, "If I am to receive food, let it be given; do not distress me by showing me wealth, or by the approach of women." His father informed him that all was prepared, and presented the food with his own hand, until he was satisfied. He then took the bowl, and preparing to depart, said, "The body is arrayed in garments and ornamented by jewels; it is like an image beautifully painted; it has hands, feet, and various members, is built about with flesh, and is subject to disease and decay; think about it well; if it

¹ While these sheets are passing through the press, our eye falls on an Italian street-ballad, presenting an odd coincidence with this incident in Rathapála's story.

² FATTO ACCADUTO IN PALERMO.

³ In cui si narra come una Dama per malinteso sospetto di gelosia, credendo il marito infedele, si uccide; e torna in vita per miracolo istantaneo fatto da Dio per intercessione della Beatissima Vergine.

⁴ In sua Casa un Cavaliere
Di Maria divoto aveva
L' Oratorio, ivi soleva
Far sue preci notte, e dì
Or la moglie, ch' ogni notte
Il Marito alzar sentia
Pien di rabbia, e gelosia
Disse un giorno a lui così.

"Sposo mio, forse altra Donna
Ami tu?" "L' amo davvero"
Sorridente il Cavaliere
Alla Dama replicò

"A una amabile Signora
Io donai tutto il mio core
Ed il tenero mio amore
A lei sempre serberò."

"Per colei dunque ogni notte
Tu ti parti?" ella riprese
E con sua gran pena intese
Che colui non lo negò.
Restò muta, e disperata,
E la notte appresso udito
Il marito già partito
Prese un ferro, e si ammazzò."

Then follows, similarly versified, the account of the miraculous revival, in answer to the husband's prayers.

were not for the manner in which it is ornamented, it would be loathsome; men and women have affection for this vile and perishing body, and none for nirwāna. The body is washed in perfumed water; the hair is braided in eight different ways, and ornamented with coronets; and the eyes are anointed with collyrium; but nirwāna is despised. Householder! you are like a man who places a gin made of withs to catch deer; you have displayed before me this wealth that I might be ensnared; but I am like the deer that eats the grass and escapes the snare; I have partaken of your food, and now depart." Having spoken these words he went away.—*Ibid.* pp. 38—41.

Still more curiously minute is the following parallel (presented to us by Mr. Spence Hardy) between the proceedings of the Buddhist priest Chittagutta, and the Western saints Peter of Alcantara, and Lewis of Gonzaga. We place them in parallel columns:—

'There was another priest, Chittagutta, who resided in the Karandu-léna, a cave in the southern province of Ceylon, upon the walls of which were painted, in a superior manner, the stories of the Budhas. The cave was visited by some priests, who greatly admired the paintings, and expressed their admiration to Chittagutta; but he replied, that he had lived there sixty years, and had never seen them, and that he should not now have known of their existence, if it had not been for their information. There was near the door of the cave a large ná-tree; but he only knew that the tree was there from the fall of the pollen and flowers. The tree itself he never saw, as he carefully observed the precept not to look upwards or to a distance. . . . When [on returning from a visit to a king] some other priests expostulated with him, for not being more respectful, and told him that he ought to have said, "May you prosper, great king! May you prosper, illustrious queens!" he replied that he knew not to whom he was speaking; he had not even noticed that they were persons of rank. On arriving at the cave, he walked at night to exercise the rite of meditation, when the *déwa* of the ná-tree caused a light to shine, by which the greatness of his abstraction was perceived, and the deities of the rocks around called out in approval. During the same night he became a rahat. From this may be learnt the benefit of keeping the eyes from wandering; they must not be permitted to roll about, like those of a monkey, or of a beast of the forest when in fear, or of a child; they must be directed downwards.'—*Ibid.* pp. 52, 53.

'Peter of Alcantara, who died in the year 1562, in order that his eyes might be more easily kept under the government of reason, and that they might not, by superfluous curiosity, break in upon the interior recollection of his mind, put them upon such restraint, that he had been a considerable time a religious man, before he knew that the church of his convent was vaulted. After having had the care of serving the refectory for half a year, he was chid by the superior for having never given the friars any of the fruit in his custody, to which the servant of God humbly answered, that he had never seen any. The truth was, he had never lifted up his eyes to the ceiling where the fruit was hanging upon twigs, as is usual in countries where grapes are dried and preserved. He lived four years in a convent without taking notice of a tree which grew near the door. He told S. Theresa that he had lived three years in a house of his order without knowing any of the friars but by their speech, as he never lifted up his eyes; if he did not follow the other friars, he was unable to find his way to many places that he frequented. It is said of Lewis Gonzaga, 1591, that although he every day waited on the Infant of Spain, James, and had to pay his respects to the empress, he never looked at her face, or took notice of her person.'—*Ibid.* p. 55.

The character of this highly-prized meditation, and the mode in which it is carried on, is sufficiently important to deserve special illustration. It appears strongly in the account of the discipline of the Noviciate. The novice's first step is, with certain ceremonies, to learn the 'threefold protective formularies,' and the ten obligations already mentioned, the Creed and Ten Commandments of the Buddhist. The mode in which his day must then be spent is detailed with a singular precision in a passage extracted by Mr. Spence Hardy from a manual called the *Dina Chariyáwa*, or daily observances of the priest. We would call attention particularly to the mixture of trifling observance with serious self-examination, religious thought, and practical discipline in kindness, justice, and humility:—

'He who, with a firm faith, believes in the religion of truth, rising before daylight, shall clean his teeth, and shall then sweep all the places that are proper to be swept, such as the court-yard, the platform near the *Bó-tree*, and the approaches to the *wihára*; after which he shall fetch the water that is required for drinking, filter it, and place it ready for use. When this is done, he shall retire to a solitary place, and for the space of three hours¹ meditate on the obligations, considering whether he has kept them or not. The bell will then ring, and he must reflect that greater than the gift of 100 elephants, 100 horses, and 100 chariots, is the reward of him who takes one step towards the place where worship is offered. Thus reflecting, he shall approach the *dágoba* (a conical erection under which some relic is placed) or the *bó-tree*, and perform that which is appointed; he shall offer flowers, just as if Budha were present in person, if flowers can be procured; meditate on the nine virtues of Budha, with a fixed and determined mind; and having worshipped, seek absolution for his negligences and faults, just as if the sacred things (before which he worships) had life. Having risen from this act of reverence, he shall proceed to the other places where worship is offered, and spreading the cloth or skin that he is accustomed to place under him, he shall again worship (with his forehead to the ground, and touching the ground with his knees and toes). The next act that he is required to perform is to look at his *lita*, or calendar, in order that he may learn the *awach'háwa* (the length of the shadow, by which, according to rules regularly laid down, varying with the time of the year, the hour of the day may be known), the age of the moon, and the years that have elapsed since the death of Budha; and then meditate on the advantages to be derived from the keeping of the obligations, carrying the alms-bowl, and putting on the yellow robe. It will now be time for him to take the alms-bowl, and when going his round, he is to bear in mind the four *karmas-thánas*, not to go too near, nor to keep at too great a distance from his *upádyá* or preceptor; at a convenient distance from the village, having swept a small space clean, he is properly to adjust his robe. If going with his *upádyá* or preceptor, he is to give the bowl into his hands, and accompany him to the village, carefully avoiding the sight of women, men, elephants, horses, chariots, or soldiers. According to the rules contained in the *Sékhíyá*, he is to proceed along the road; and after the alms have been received, he is to retire from the village in the manner previously declared. Taking the bowl and outer robe of his superior, he shall then proceed to the *wihára*. If there be a place appointed for the robe, he shall put it there

¹ There are sixty hours in one day.

after folding it; then place a seat, wash his feet, inquire if he is thirsty, place before him the tooth-cleaner, and bring the alms-bowl, or if this be refused, a small portion of rice. The stanzas must be repeated that are appointed to be said before eating, after eating, and when the things are received that may be used as sick diet; and the food is to be eaten in the manner laid down in the *Sékhiyá*. Then taking the bowl of his superior he shall wash it, put it in the sunshine to dry, and deposit it afterwards in its proper place. This being done, he is to wash his own face, and putting on his robe, he is first to worship his superior, and then Budha. The next act is to go again to some solitary place, and there repeat the appointed stanzas, considering whether he has omitted the practice of any obligation, or in any way acted contrary to them, after which he must exercise *maitri-bhāwanā*, or the meditation of kindness and affection. About an hour afterwards, when his weariness is gone, he is to read one of the sacred books or write out a portion of one; and if he has anything to ask from his preceptor, or to tell him, this is the time at which it should be done. In some convenient place the *bana* is to be read; and when this is concluded, if there be time before the setting of the sun, he is again to sweep the courtyard, &c. as before.

One by one each day, in regular order, the *sāmanéra* novices shall kindle a fire, light a lamp, make all ready for the reading of the *bana*, call the priest who is appointed to recite it, wash his feet, sit down in an orderly manner and listen to the *bana*, and then repeat the pirit, or ritual of priestly exorcism. Having done whatever is necessary to be done for the guru, and offered him worship, if the novice has doubts respecting any matter, he must ask to have them solved; or if accustomed to read the sacred books as a lesson, it must now be done, and he must repeat the *Sékhiyá* and *Chatupárasudhi-sīla*. If there be in the same *wihāra* a priest older than himself, he is to render him all necessary assistance, such as to wash his feet, and anoint them with oil, and after offering to him worship, he must ask permission to retire. Reclining in the place where he intends to sleep, he is again to repeat the four stanzas and the four *karmasthānas*, as before, and reflect that in the morning he will have to rise. Having slept, he is to rise in the morning before daybreak, and after again repeating the four stanzas and the four *karmasthānas*, he must repeat the pirit taken from the *Ratana-sūtra*, exercise *maitri-bhāwanā*, and do all that is required to be done. In the morning, as well as at night, he is to reflect on the eight things that produce sorrow, on the infirmities of the body, on death, and on all that is declared in the *Dasa-dhamma-sūtra*. Not giving his mind to the four things that lead to hell, viz. evil desire, anger, fear, and ignorance, should he know that any priest in the community has committed an error, he must go and declare it to him in a friendly manner, by which he will derive the benefit that follows right speech. If there be a priest who lives according to the precepts, and is obedient thereto, he is like one who does personal service to Budha; he honours Budha, acknowledges that he is supreme, and offers to him that which is the most excellent *pújá*, or oblation. The *sāmanéra* is then to reflect whether he has rightly attended to the *Dina Chariyāwa*; if he has done so, he must remain silent upon the subject, saying nothing about it; but if he finds that he has neglected obedience in any one particular, and is examined by the guru, he shall confess his fault. When anything has been done without due consideration, inadvertently, he is to bring a measure of sand, and sprinkle it in the sacred court. He must at all times be ready to do that which is necessary to be done for his preceptor, and to the more aged priests he must be respectful and obedient, washing their feet without any pride. With the four articles that he has received as a novice, of what kind soever they may be, whether good or bad, he must rest contented; nor must he covet to have anything

more than the allowed requisites of the priesthood. Maintaining a course of good behaviour, he must keep under the five senses, with matured wisdom, and without any haughtiness of either body, speech, or mind. He must not associate with those who are not ascetics, nor follow their customs; and he must be careful to avoid the commission of the least crime. By this means he will render an oblation worthy of Budha, the ruler of the world. This is the Dina Chariyáwa.'—*Ibid.* pp. 24—27.

The contrivances by which the attention is to be fixed on the object of meditation are sometimes whimsical, sometimes loathsome. In many of them a distinct purpose is visible, which is carried out sometimes with a kind of imaginative force and wildness, sometimes with a subtle and business-like inventiveness, which we often find in Roman Catholic books of devotion, when they have to grapple with a corrupt tendency of the human heart. Sometimes, however, the forms pursued are simply and inconceivably absurd. The following is the process by which the priest is to attain *nimitta*, or 'illumination,' a state apparently of half trance or ecstasy. He must begin by selecting a proper locality, and placing in it a tablet of properly prepared clay. He must then

'take water that falls from a rock, and therewith render the clay perfectly smooth and even, like the head of a drum; then, having bathed, he must sweep the place where the frame is erected, and place a seat, without any irregularities, on its surface, one span and four inches high, at the distance of two cubits and one span from the frame. Remaining upon this seat, he must look at the circle, and exercise meditation. If the seat be further distant than the prescribed space, he will not be able to see the circle properly; and if nearer, its imperfections will be too apparent. If it be higher, he will have to bend his neck to see the circle; if lower, his knees will be pained. Thus seated, he must reflect on the evils resulting from the repetition of existence, and on the manner in which it is to be overcome; on the benefits received by those who practice the dhyānas and other modes of asceticism; and on the excellences of the three gems; and he must resolve upon securing the same advantages. He must not keep his eyes open too long, lest he become confused. The circle must be seen, but not too clearly, or his object cannot be gained; still, it is necessary that it be seen with a certain degree of distinctness, or his aim will be equally frustrated. He must be like a man who watches an elephant, not too intent, nor too careless; or, like a man looking at himself in a mirror, who does not notice the form of the instrument, but regards his own appearance alone. The colour of the circle must be noticed, but not with too much pleasure or satisfaction. It is not enough to think that it is composed of earth. The priest must also remember that the earthly particles of his own body are composed of the same element. For this purpose he must think of the different names that are given to earth, such as pathawi, mahi, médini, bhūmi, wasudhá, and wasundará. Any of these names may be chosen, and, for a time, he may reflect on that exclusively; but as the epithet most commonly used is pathawi, upon this he must meditate with greater frequency and intensity. Until *nimitta* is received, sometimes with his eyes open, and at other times with them shut, he must continually regard the circle, though the exercise has to be repeated a hundred or a thousand times. When the circle appears to the mind as clearly with the

eyes shut as with them open, the nimitta may be regarded as accomplished.—*Ibid.* pp. 254, 255.

The exercise must not be continued after *nimitta* has been gained, or it will be lost again. The circle, when it has accomplished its object, will only distract the attention. The priest, therefore, is to go home in his state of illumination, and then meditate afresh. The following form of meditation, loathsome as it is, has a more visible purpose in it, reminding one of the skull and cross-bones of the Christian hermit. It is the meditation in a cemetery on the offensive parts of a dead body:—

‘He must go to the place of meditation with joy; as a king goes to the hall where he is to be anointed, or a brahman to the yāga sacrifice, or a poor man to the place where there is hidden treasure. He may take with him a staff to drive away dogs and wild beasts. In the exercise, he must turn his eyes and ears inward, and must not allow them to wander after anything that is without, save that he must remember the direction in which he came. In approaching the body he must not come from the leeward, or he may be overpowered by the smell, and his mind will become confused; but if there be in the other direction any rock, fence, water, or other hindrance, he may approach the body from the leeward, provided he cover his nostrils with the corner of his robe. In fixing his eyes on the body, he must look athwart the course of the wind; he must not stand near the head or the feet, but opposite the abdomen; not too near, or he may be afraid, nor too far off, or the offensive properties will not rightly appear. He must meditate on the colour of the body: its sex, age, and different members, joints, and properties; that this is the head, this the abdomen, and that these are the feet; and he must pass in order to the different parts of the body, and number every joint, from the foot to the head. Thus, in relation to the hair of the head, the following reflections must be made:—“It is different to all other parts of the body, . . . it is in every respect impure; when not regularly cleaned, it becomes offensive; and when thrown into the fire it sends forth a disagreeable smell.” Fixing his eyes on the body, he must think a hundred and a thousand times on its offensiveness . . . And at times he must shut his eyes and think inwardly and intensely on the same subjects. All dead bodies are alike; the body of the king cannot be distinguished from that of the outcaste, nor the body of the outcaste from that of the king.’—*Ibid.* pp. 248, 249.

Here is another method:—

‘He who rightly perceives that all continued existence is sorrow, choosing the root of some tree in a solitary part of the forest, sits under it with his feet bent up and his body straight; then collecting his thoughts, with a calm mind he makes an inspiration and an expiration of the breath. Drawing a long breath through the nostrils, he notices, I have thus drawn a long breath. Breathing a long spiration from the nostrils, he notices, I have thus breathed a long spiration from the nostrils. Drawing a short breath through the nostrils, he notices, I have drawn a short spiration through the nostrils. Reflecting that the beginning, the middle, and the end of every kind of breath is from the body, he resolves, with a wise mind I will draw an inspiration; with a wise mind I will breathe out an expiration. In a manner so as not to fill the cavity of the nose, restraining the violence or magnitude of

his breath, he makes an inspiration, and noticing, I thus make an inspiration, he disciplines his mind; then making an expiration, he notices, I thus make an expiration. Reflecting on the joy connected with the exercise of the first dhyána, and causing its production, he thus makes an inspiration and an expiration . . . Indulging comprehensive thoughts, he makes an inspiration and an expiration. Restraining comprehensive thoughts, he makes an inspiration and an expiration."—*Ibid.* p. 267.

And so he goes on inspiring and expiring through various internal exercises of charity, and a series of meditations on the impermanency of things earthly, the various forms of evil desire, and other religious subjects.

But a really lofty and searching morality is embodied in the Maitri bhawána, or meditation of kindness already mentioned. When the priest finds it difficult to exercise this meditation upon his enemy, all the different expedients of charity are one after another put in use. He is to remember how in his enemy good is mixed with, and may be disguised by bad; he is to think only of the good, and not of the bad; if there is no good, he is to consider with pity how his enemy will suffer for his wickedness; if this will not do, he is to think of the rewards of benevolence, or the consequences to himself of indulging hatred. 'He who indulges in enmity is like one who throws ashes to windward, which come back to the same place, and cover him all over.' He may be born in hell for it. Then he is to remember that in some anterior life his present enemy may have been his father, brother, friend, or benefactor. 'If all these reflections are insufficient, the priest must think, "What am I at enmity with? Is it with the hair, or with the bones, or with what?" Thus his hatred will have nothing upon which to fasten, even as nothing can be placed upon the mustard-seed, or painted upon the air.' . . . 'There is yet one more expedient. The priest must give something to his enemy, or must receive from him, if he is willing to give it. And in this manner even should the enmity have existed from previous ages, it will be overcome.' Minute and fanciful as they may be called, there is a remarkable purpose and ingenuity about this series of expedients for reaching the heart; and in the last a curious and just appreciation of the pride of human enmity. Nor is the benefit of this exercise confined to human beings. In the eye of the pantheist, every form of life is divine; and the Buddhist hagiology extends accordingly to animals:—

'Whilst a cow was giving suck to its calf, a hunter tried to pierce it with a javelin, but his efforts were in vain; he could not take its life. It was not by the power of samádhi, or any other attainment, that this took place; it was from the affection manifested towards its offspring at the moment; and in this way may be learnt the greatness of the meditation of kindness.'—*Ibid.* p. 246.

But while the priest applies his mind, with a curious mixture of subtlety and wildness, seriousness and whimsicality, to human duties and the natural world, we are impressed throughout (at least in the representations of Mr. Spence Hardy) with the absence of a personal God. The system appears 'groaning and travailing,'—the persons seem to be feeling about if haply they may find Him who is so near to them—clinging to what they have of good—straining after something unearthly and exalted, sometimes better, sometimes worse than themselves—inconsistent and tottering in their views when most approaching the truth. But a veil appears to separate them even from a tangible, dogmatical and substantial Theism. As in a dream we pass through all the anticipations and preliminaries of a pageant, but when the great sight should be actually present, our imagination seems to break down, and an unaccountable film spreads itself before our eyes—so Buddhism seems to falter and break down as it approaches the doctrine of a God. We have before us a confused and wonderful mass of the circumstances, consequences, and paraphernalia of belief, but the object of that belief is strangely unsubstantial. The priest exercises his mind in love towards all beings—and specifically towards his enemies, the poor, and the deserving. We learn in detail how he is to dwell on the priestly decalogue, the vanity of physical existence, the loathsomeness of the human frame, the natural world and its moral uses, and the benefits of ascetic abstraction. But little appears of meditation on God. We are only told, shortly, that the novice is to meditate on the nine virtues of Budha, and the priest on 'the excellencies of the three gems.' What constitutes this direct meditation on that Being, which, if anything, is the Deity, or on what it is to take hold, does not appear, either from the writings of Mr. Spence Hardy or from those of M. Huc. Here is the all-important contrast between Buddhism and Christianity, which, as we know, especially consists in devotion to a person—the person of Christ. And this contrast blends everywhere with the parallel which we are now drawing between Buddhism and Rome, whether we regard the latter in her dignity, her trifling, or her corruptions.

The following passage from Cardinal Bona's '*Via Compendii ad Deum*,' sweeps, as it were, along the whole subject of mystical meditation:—

'Alvarez enumerates fifteen phrases relating to contemplation, as explaining its different stages; they are these:—The intuition of truth; the retirement of the soul to its interior; spiritual silence; rest; union; hearing the voice of God; spiritual sleep; ecstasy; rapture (*raptus*); the corporal appearance of Christ and the Saints; their imaginary appearance; the intellectual vision; the vision of God in darkness; the admirable vision of God relieved from darkness; the clear and intuitive vision of God, which,

although proper to the Saints, has yet, as some theologians properly teach, been given to some very holy men even in this life.'

And the practical details of meditation are laid down with the same accurate minuteness with which the subject is mapped out. Perhaps the most remarkable application of this system is to be found in the 'Spiritual Exercises' of Ignatius Loyola, which are said to exert an almost incredible power over the minds of those who are subjected to them. The careful and searching rules which stand at the opening of that book exhibit Rome in her dignity and power. It is difficult to extract from so coherent a course of teaching. But we will take a few passages. First, as to the preparation for meditation:—

'Cap. II. § 2.—*Immediate preparation for Meditation.*

'While yet a pace or two distant from the spot where he is to meditate, let him, for about long enough to recite the Lord's prayer, think of his Lord Jesus as God and man, or of the Most Holy Trinity, or (lest his fancy should wander) let him perform as perfect an act of faith as he can, and believe in a lively manner that God is before him, looking upon what he is about to do, to whom he should do reverence with humble gestures, first bowing, and then kneeling before God, of whose Divine presence he should, as far as he can, consider himself most unworthy, and should lament because of his unworthiness and his sins; yet, relying on the mercy of God, let him then offer himself and all he has, by a preparatory prayer, as above laid down.

'Observe that all this immediate preparation may and ought to be done in a very short time, being, as it were, only a kind of introduction to the meditation and not its principal fruit.'

* * * * *

'§ 4.—*The disposition of the body before Meditation.*

'He may now begin the contemplation itself from the first head of thought, now prostrate on the ground with his face either upwards or downwards; now sitting or standing in the posture in which he hopes most easily to compass what he desires; wherein these two points should be observed. First, that if he obtains his desire while kneeling, or in any other posture, he should so remain. Secondly, that he should rest upon that head of meditation by which he has obtained the devotion which he seeks, without attempting to proceed further, until he has fully satisfied himself.

'Note, that this disposition of body, which is here prescribed for the beginning of the meditation, is only to be used at home and alone; never in church or before others, where he should adopt only that posture which is customary in public worship.'

The following again are three modes of prayer, or rather of devotional thought, for those who are not equal to more sustained meditation:—

'Cap. VI. § 1.—*Of the first method of Prayer.*

'The first method of praying is by a short consideration of the precepts of God and the Church, of the seven deadly sins, of the three powers of the soul and of the five senses of the body, in the following manner:—

'First, of the precepts, reflecting how he may have failed to keep them, and proposing to keep them better in future. Secondly, of the sins, reflect-

ing how easily he has committed them, and determining in future to avoid them more diligently. Thirdly, of the powers of the mind and the senses, observing how he has used them amiss, and concluding thenceforth to imitate Christ or His Mother in the use of them.

* * * * *

‘ § 3.—Of the second method of Prayer.

‘ The second method of prayer is this, that kneeling or sitting (according to our bodily habit and devotion of mind), and our eyes either shut or fixed on one point, and not moving hither and thither, we should recite the words of some prayer, and pause upon the first word, until various meanings, analogies, spiritual savours, and other devout emotions arise in our minds; and so we should proceed onwards through all the words of the prayer.

‘ On the conclusion of any prayer an address must be made to that person to whom it had relation.’

* * * * *

‘ § 5.—Of the third method of Prayer.

‘ The third method of prayer is this, that we should utter each word of a prayer between each breath that we take, considering in the mean time either the meaning of the word, or the dignity of the person to whom it relates, or our own vileness, or, lastly, the distance between us.

‘ This method is of use to give us a habit of saying prayers with fitting attention and devotion, following the saying of the Apostle, “I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also.” Wherefore this exercise is very profitable for those who are bound to observe the canonical hours or other forms of prayer.’

We need hardly draw attention to the points of detail in which these extracts run curiously parallel with those which we have made from Buddhist books. We quote them as far more instructively illustrating the force and elevation which the Christian teacher derives from the distinctness of his aim and the personality of the object of his devotion.

The same contrast appears when we descend to less admirable characteristics of the Roman system. Budhism trifles in its minute physical investigations and analogies—its catalogues of the parts and characteristics of the human body—of colours, forms, and properties. It informs us that the human frame is composed of 360 bones, 900 veins, and as many muscles—it bids us meditate on the parts of the body and the names of the earth—it encourages elaborate disputations on a fowl’s gizzard. Rome, on the contrary, dwells with a painful, sometimes shocking minuteness on the circumstances of those persons whom she venerates, from the greatest downwards. This perhaps is most shown in the stories which are produced for the use of the vulgar. We take one with some reluctance from a scrap of paper which lies before us, picked up at hazard in an Italian town, for which it is fair to say the authorities are no further responsible than in allowing it to be printed at Rome with the words ‘*Con approv.*’ at the bottom.

'Account given by our Lord Jesus Christ to the sisters Elizabeth, Martha, and Bridget, who desired to know some particulars of his passion, and to whom he appeared when they had finished their prayer, and said:—

'First know, my dear sisters, that I received 112 blows on the cheeks; I had 3 blows upon the mouth when I was taken in the garden; as I went to the house of Annas I fell 7 times; I was thrown upon the ground 105 times; I had 180 strokes upon the back, 32 blows upon the legs; I was lifted up by the beard and the hair of my head 32 times; I received 1 mortal thrust; at the column I received 6,666 stripes; I breathed 126 sighs; I was drawn and dragged about 33 times; I had 100 wounds in my head; I had 3 mortal wounds upon the cross; they spit in my face 52 times; they gave me 1,000 wounds; there were 300 soldiers who took me, 3 who carried me when I was bound; and I shed 38,514 drops of blood. I will grant 5 graces to the souls of those who will say 7 Paters and Aves daily for the space of 23 years and 12 days, which will complete the number of the drops of my blood. 1. I will give to them plenary indulgence and the remission of all their sins. 2. The pains of purgatory shall not hurt them. 3. If they die before the aforesaid time, I will do to them as if they had completed it. 4. I will treat them as if they had died martyrs and had shed their blood for the faith. 5. I will come from heaven at the hour of their death to receive their souls into my arms, and to all in their houses and to their relations to the fourth degree, and if they are in purgatory, I will take them thence to enjoy the heavenly country of life eternal.

'This account was found in the holy sepulchre, and whoever bears it about him will be secure from the devil, and from all bad death. And if a pregnant woman carries it about her, she will have an easy delivery.'

The coarse particularity of this passage, (claiming, be it observed, Divine origin,) would be completely in place among the grosser superstitions of Buddhism—scarcely less so than it would be out of place if appended to the majestic narrative of the Gospel or the pathetic anticipations of Jewish prophecy. To a Christian it is made more revolting than heathenism by that very circumstance which is the elevating element of Loyola's spiritual exercises—the directness with which it fastens itself on the person of our Lord.

Again, take the following passage, in which the beautiful sentence ascribed to the Abbot Macarius shines like a jewel in a heap of glass beads:—

'On this subject (of ejaculatory prayer) much may be drawn from the lives of the Fathers. The Abbot Isaiah saw the prayer of a certain monk, while he was eating, rise like a flame of fire into the sight of God. Another person offered 103 prayers while he was talking with others. The Abbot Macarius, when consulted by some as to the mode of praying, said, "There is no need to say much in prayer; but frequently to stretch out our hands and say, Lord, as Thou wilt and knowest, have mercy upon me." Moses the Ethiopian, formerly a chief of robbers, said 50 prayers daily. The monk Paul, 300. A certain virgin, 700. Theodoret relates that Simeon Stylites said numberless prayers daily, so that a man counted once 1,244, leaving out others, because he lost himself and left off counting. Father D. Martinez said *Deo gratias* 600 times, and exhorted others to do the same, saying that no prayer was shorter, none more pleasing to God. A member of the Society of Jesus, Jacobus Certulus by name, offered every day innumerable acts of love and thanksgiving, which sometimes amounted

to 24,000, and renewed his vows 3,000 times a-day. There were some persons, under the direction of Father Gonsalvus Sylveria, who asked the Divine assistance 10,000 times a-day, in a short prayer.'

Most readers will be surprised at the ledger-like minuteness with which these prayers are posted, reminding us of the 'at per 100' of mercantile phraseology. But it is not the less to be noticed that, unlike the observances of Budhism, they are all direct supplications addressed by a human being to the Person of his Maker.

But we must go somewhat further. It not unnaturally follows from the impersonal character of Budhism that those high powers of saving souls and removing mountains which Christ imparted to ardent faith in Him, are ascribed by the Budhist to a certain transcendental grasp or appreciation of truth. Sometimes this truth is of a religious character, and apprehended by a religious man; but sometimes not. The following is perhaps an instance of the former kind:—

'On a certain day, when Maha Tissa resided in the rock Chétiya, he went to the city of Anurádhapura to receive alms, and in the way met a female who had quarrelled with her husband, and was returning in consequence to her parents. She was a beautiful woman, and arrayed in a very splendid manner. Wishing to attract the attention of the priest, she smiled; but by so doing she showed her teeth, and on seeing them he thought only of the impermanence of the body; by which means he attained rahatship. Soon afterwards he met her husband in the street, who asked him if he had seen a woman; but he replied that he had seen only a loathsome skeleton; whether it were that of a male or female he could not tell.'—*Eastern Monachism*, p. 52.

But sometimes the same miraculous energy is ascribed to the mere vigorous enunciation of a base formula, by a base person; powerful only because it is true and because it is put forth with a certain inexplicable force of belief. This at least is the best explanation which suggests itself for such a story as the following most singular one:—

'There was once a courtesan, Bindumati, who turned the course of the mighty Ganges by the force of this spell, founded upon the manner in which she exercised her base vocation. "The king," according to the original authority, "hearing the rushing sound of the reflux river, being greatly astonished, inquired of his chiefs; Friends, why does the current of the great Ganges flow backwards? They replied: Great king, the courtesan, Bindumati, has recited the satcha kiriya, in consequence of which the Ganges flows back to its head. The astonished king hastened to the courtesan, and said: Is it true that by the satcha kiriya, you have turned the course of the Ganges? When she replied: Yes, your majesty: he asked: Whence have you that power? Who will receive your declaration? By what power can an insignificant person like you cause the stream of the Ganges to flow backward? She replied: Great king, I caused the stream to flow back by the power of truth (satcha). The king said: What power of truth have you, a thief, vile, immodest, sinful, an overstepper of all restrictions, one who leads astray the blindly lascivious?'

The courtesan confessed that she was all the king had named, but said that it was by the following truth-spell she had turned the stream of the Ganges, and that by the same power she could overturn the heavens; 'Does any one give me wealth, be he a prince, a brahman, a merchant, a labourer, or of any other tribe; whatever they may be, I receive them equally: the prince is not preferred, the labourer is not despised: contented, and free from regarding pleasure or pain, I follow the owner of wealth.'—*Ibid.* pp. 279, 280.

Christians might have hoped that their religion would furnish no parallel to such a fable as this; but the hope would be disappointed. Error bears corruption, as a vein of rottenness throws out poisonous fungi. A Protestant will not be surprised to see that the saint worship into which Rome has 'developed' the personal element of Christianity, has produced legends more shocking to morality than that which we have quoted from the *Sútra Pitaka*; and for this we may unhappily appeal, not to a street ballad or unauthorized fly-leaf, but to an unimpeachable authority in the Roman communion. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori is, perhaps, one of the writers most venerated and most influential in the modern Roman Church. He was born towards the end of the seventeenth century, and in the year 1802 his works were examined at Rome with a view to his canonization. It was duly reported *nihil censurâ dignum fuisse repertum*, and after all the necessary steps, approved in every stage by the Congregation of Sacred Rights and the Pope, his canonization was decreed in the year 1830. His biographer tells us that his devotion to the Virgin was considered by the pope a special element in his merit, (*Vita di S. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori*, Roma, 1839, p. 380,) if so, the book from which the following extracts are taken—the *Glorie di Maria*, may be considered as having received a special indorsement by the highest authority of his Church. It is certainly one of those which is most popular and influential in forming the minds of the Italian clergy, and used, at least, to be most frequently seen on those bookshelves which hang at the bedside of a young seminarist. We believe, therefore, that in quoting it we are appealing to an authority to which no earnest Romanist can demur.

There is some difficulty in saying anything shortly on this subject. If we quote the succinct statement of a theologian, we are told that it must be interpreted by the popular teaching of the Church—if we appeal to a popular practice, we are told that it must be understood in the sense in which it is explained, or explained away, by the doctors of the Church. Then there are the usual charges of taking literally what is said rhetorically—of citing passages unexplained by their context, or of quoting as characteristic what is in fact exceptional—charges which it is hardly possible for a writer to forestall, without burying himself

in the mass of his own quotations and comments. Liguori, however, is in some of these respects a convenient referee. He is a theologian—but he is writing a book evidently for popular use. He adopts broadly the broad principles of preceding theologians. ‘Nunquam peribit qui genitrici Virgini devotus sedulusque extiterit.’ ‘*Quantumcunque quis fuerit peccator, si Mariæ devotus extiterit, nunquam in æternum peribit.*’ ‘Fieri non potest ut pereat qui Mariæ sedulus et humilis cultor extiterit.’ ‘It is the sentiment of many theologians, and specially of S. Thomas, that for many persons who have even died in mortal sin, the divine mother has obtained from God the suspension of their sentence and their return to life to perform penance. And of this many examples are recorded by grave authors.’ (Vol. i. pp. 253, 256, 257.) And he particularly protests against those who grudge to expressions of this class their full force, or attempt to mitigate or explain them away. (P. 165.) We may fairly, therefore, take in their natural and obvious meaning the following stories, by which he attempts to illustrate the power of a mere recitation of a prayer to the Virgin, used by persons of infamous life, disjoined from all desire or intention of holiness or repentance, and not always amounting even to that ‘humble and sedulous’ devotion which is extolled in the passages quoted from Ignatius and Blossius. We do not quote these stories for the purpose of pointing out the real irreverence of imposing on the holy Virgin (we almost shrink from writing the words) the character of a weak woman, captivated by mere external and personal attentions—that very lip-service which is denounced in Scripture as most hateful to God: we quote them to illustrate the supernatural power which is ascribed to a mere formality, justly characterised by Liguori himself as a ‘wretched devotion’—‘questa misera divozione.’ They show that the virtue which Buddhists attribute to a mere abstract apprehension of truth, Roman Catholics are equally ready to discover in the most empty devotion to the fashionable object of worship.

‘The same father found a sinner in the hospital, who had not confessed for fifty-five years, and had only performed this wretched act of devotion—that is, that when he saw an image of Mary, he saluted it, and prayed that she would not cause him to die in mortal sin; and then he told how he had broken his sword in a quarrel with his enemy; and had then turned to the Madonna and said to her, “Alas! now I shall be killed, and damned. Mother of sinners! help me.” And in saying this, he found himself, without knowing how, transported to a safe place. And having made a general confession, he died full of confidence,’ (*se ne morì pieno di confidenza*).—*Glorie di Maria*, vol. i. p. 241.

‘In the year 1604 there were in a city of Flanders two young students, who, instead of attending to their studies, gave themselves up wholly to debauchery and evil living. One night, when they had been in the house of a bad woman, after some time one of them, named Richard, returned home, the other remained. While Richard was undressing to go to bed,

he remembered that he had not that day recited any Ave Marias to the Blessed Virgin, as he was accustomed to do. Being heavy with sleep, it annoyed him, nevertheless he exerted himself and recited them, though without devotion and half asleep (*mezzo dormendo*). Then he lay down, and in his first sleep, he heard a loud knock at the door, and immediately afterwards, without the door being opened, he saw his companion before him all defiled and horrible. "Who art thou?" he said. "Do you not know me?" answered the other. "But how thou art changed, thou appearest to be a demon." "Unhappy me!" exclaimed the wretch, "I am damned." "And how?" "Know," he said, "that when I left that infamous house, a demon came and strangled me. My body lies in the street; my soul is in hell. Know," he then added, "that the same punishment awaited thee, but the Blessed Virgin, on account of that little homage of the Ave Marias, delivered thee from it. Happy, if thou knowest how to avail thyself of this warning, which the mother of God sends to thee through me!" So saying, the damned man opened his cloak, showed him the flames and serpents which tormented him, and disappeared. Then the youth, bursting into a flood of tears, threw himself with his face on the ground to thank his deliverer, Mary; and while he was thinking about changing his life, he heard the matin bell ring in the Franciscan monastery. Then he said, "Here God calls me to do penance." He went that same hour to the convent to entreat the fathers to receive him. They hesitated, as knowing his evil life, but he told them the whole story, weeping bitterly; and two fathers going to that street, found in truth the body of his companion as black as a coal; and they received him. Richard thenceforth led an exemplary life. He afterwards went to India to preach the faith; thence to Japan, and there finally had the lot and the grace to die a martyr for Jesus Christ, being burnt alive.—*Ibid.* Pp. 259—261.

It is related by P. Carolus Bovius, that at Domans, in France, there was a man who, having a wife, held sinful intercourse with another woman. The wife not being able to endure this, did nothing but pray for punishments from God for them, and especially one day she went to an altar of the Blessed Virgin, which was in a certain church, to seek for justice upon the woman who had taken from her her husband. And that other sinner went every day to recite an Ave Maria to the same image. One night the divine Mother appeared in a dream to the aforesaid wife, who seeing her, began at once the old cry:—"Justice, Mother of God, justice." But the Madonna answered, "Justice? Dost thou seek justice from me? Go seek some other who will give it thee, I cannot do it for thee. Know (she then added) that this sinner every day recites a salutation to me which, if it be recited to me by any person, I cannot permit that they should suffer or be punished for their sins." When day dawned, the wife went to hear mass in the same Church of the Madonna, and as she left it, she met her husband's mistress, and began to abuse her, saying that she was a sorceress, and by her sorceries had even bewitched the Holy Virgin. "Silence," said the people, "what are you saying?" "Why should I be silent?" she answered, "what I say is truer than truth itself. This night the Madonna appeared to me, and when I sought justice from her, she answered that she could not give it because of a prayer which that wretch recites to her every day." They then asked the other what prayer it was that she recited to the Mother of God. She answered that it was the Ave Maria. But when she heard that because of this wretched devotion the Blessed Virgin had shown her so much mercy, she went at once to throw herself before the holy image, and there in the presence of all, asking pardon for her scandalous life, vowed perpetual continence. And having become a nun, and having built for herself a little room close to the church, she shut herself up in it, and there persevered till death in continual penitence.—*Ibid.* p. 297.

The circumstance that all these stories end with a repentance, does not interfere with their evident moral, which is this—not, indeed, that sinners can be saved without repentance, but that if they recite a proper number of Ave Marias, they *need not trouble themselves for the present about repentance*; as in that case the Virgin Mary will not suffer them to be chastised for their sins, or cut off in them—or if cut off, will procure a suspension of the divine law, to save them from the consequences of being so cut off. The object of most Christian teachers is to persuade sinners that ‘now is the accepted time,’—that they cannot with safety defer for a moment the painful effort of conversion. But these stories, if true, would show that a man might with very tolerable safety persevere in sin if he is only punctual in paying his devotions to the Virgin Mary. It is true that Liguori, who was doubtless a good man, earnestly deprecates this mode of applying his principles, somewhat as a respectable Antinomian beseeches his congregation to be moral in spite of the encouragement which *his* Gospel holds out to vice. It would be as mad, he argues, to risk dying in mortal sin in hope that Mary would deliver us from hell, as to throw ourselves into a pit because Mary has saved some from death who have done so. But a principle does not change its nature, because we are entreated not to draw from it its natural conclusion. And the principle resulting from all, and broadly announced in the last of these stories, appears to us to rank with the most pernicious of those which Budhism has to show. It is worse than the story of Bindumati, so far as the salvation of human souls is a graver subject than the flux or reflux of a river.

But it is time to proceed to the third part of this subject—the actual working and religious polity of Budhism. And here we almost lose sight of Mr. Spence Hardy, and return to our more lively friend M. Huc and the great Tartaro-Chinese empire. Some inconsistencies may be found between the doctrines of Ceylon and the facts of Tartary. But we think it probable that a truer idea will be given by taking M. Huc’s account of the facts which he records, than by a necessarily conjectural attempt to harmonize the two.

Tartary is an immense hierarchy, in which the Lamas or priests compose, according to M. Huc, at least one third of the population. In most families the eldest son alone remains a ‘black man;’ the others become Lamas. To that state they are devoted in the first instance by their parents, but they gradually attach themselves to it, and contract universally ‘a certain religious exaltation’ and sense of authority, by which our missionaries appear to have been much impressed.

The obligations of a priest have been already described in our

quotations from Mr. Spence Hardy; but that gentleman appears to treat them rather as a matter of literature than as a matter of fact. And so, we presume, they are to be considered in Ceylon. From M. Huc we should have gathered that Lamas are obliged to a stricter performance of the moral law than the rest of the community; and, moreover, to wear a certain dress, to keep certain ceremonial observances, to abstain from taking animal life in any form, and to maintain the rule of celibacy. The last rule is evidently the trial of the system. Any breach of it by a person holding the priestly character, (like theft, murder, or a false profession of having attained the rahatship,) entails a permanent exclusion from the priesthood. But it is most important to add that any priest may, on 'confession of his weakness,' throw off for a time the character and obligations of a priest, and be afterwards re-admitted to his order. (*East. Mon.* pp. 8, 9.) It is obvious that by such a relaxation the rule itself might be almost entirely neutralized. The practice, however, seems to differ in different places. In Ceylon it is very rare for a priest to put off his habit. In Siam it is very common. We should gather from M. Huc, that in Tartary it was not sufficiently frequent to invalidate the general rule. We hear, indeed, in one instance, of a revolt by a knot of married Lamas, but the nascent reformation was soon put down, and we are not told of priestly libertinage, either in their ordinary yellow or their exceptional black coats.

M. Huc divides the Lamas into three classes. The first is of a common-place kind. It is composed of men who live in their families, and are only distinguished from laymen by their yellow dress, and their personal fulfilment (such as it may be) of the priestly obligations. They serve to educate the young at home, and by their presence to keep alive throughout the country that deep attachment to their religion, and reverence for holy men and things which are characteristic of the Tartar.

The second is a more singular class—we must give M. Huc's description of them. They are called the wandering, or vagabond Lamas.

'They live like birds of passage, settling themselves nowhere; ever driven onward by some secret restlessness or vague hatred of repose. They wander only for the sake of wandering—to get over the ground—to change their place; they go from Lamaserie to Lamaserie, and stop, on their road, in all the tents that they come across, sure that Tartar hospitality will never fail them. They enter without ceremony, and sit down beside the hearth; tea is warmed for them, and as they drink, they recount with pride the number of countries they have traversed. If the fancy takes them to pass the night in the tent, they stretch themselves in a corner and sleep soundly till the morrow. In the morning, before starting again on their wanderings, they stand an instant in front of the tent, looking vaguely at the clouds and the tops of the mountains, turning their heads on one side and the other, as if

to take counsel with the winds. At last they start, always without an end, only guided by the paths which they see by chance before them. They go on with their heads bent forward, their eyes on the ground, a long stick in their hands, and a knapsack of sheep-skin on their backs. When they are tired, they rest at the foot of a rock, the top of a mountain, the bottom of a ravine, wherever their inconstant fancy drives them. Often in their journey they meet only the desert, and then, wherever night overtakes them, they sleep beneath the sky; the cover, as they say, of that immense tent which men call the world.

‘These wandering Lamas visit all the countries accessible to them; China, Mantchourie, the Khalkas, the different kingdoms of southern Mongolia, Ouriang-hai, Koukon-Noor, the north and south of the Celestial Mountains, Thibet, India, and sometimes even Turkey. There is no river which they have not crossed, nor mountain which they have not climbed, nor Grand Lama before whom they have not prostrated themselves, nor people among whom they have not dwelt, and whose manners, customs, and tongue they have not learnt. In all their wanderings, the danger of straying from the road and losing themselves in the desert does not exist for them. As they travel without object, the places they arrive at are always those they wish to go to. The legend of the Wandering Jew seems exactly realized in these Lamas. They seem under the influence of a secret power which drives them restlessly from place to place. One might believe that God had mingled with their blood some of that motive power by which the worlds are driven unceasingly along their orbits.’—Vol. i. pp. 189—192.

The third, and by far the most important class of Lamas, are those who live in Lamaseries, *wiharas* as they would be called in Ceylon, or as we will at once venture to call them, convents. In Tartary these establishments are numerous and very large. The Convent of the Thousand Lamas contains four times what its name implies—that of Koun-boum the same number, those in the Blue City twenty thousand, and that of the Great Kouren (of which hereafter) with the dependencies in its immediate neighbourhood, contains no less than thirty thousand members. But before proceeding to these, we must shortly notice the somewhat distinct class of Contemplative Lamas—a class of ascetics which Mr. Spence Hardy supposes to be extinct, but which M. Huc found not uncommon in Tartary and Thibet. We have seen that the father of the chief, Proul Tamba, was the pupil of one such personage; some more were visited by our travellers on the top of a precipitous mountain above the convent of Tchogorten. One was inaccessible, communicating with the world below only by a bag, rope, and pulley. It is stated that when the convent was plundered by brigands, the ascetics were spared. The fact, however, can scarcely be considered as very significant, for a robber must have been much in want of professional amusement, who could find any in clambering up a perpendicular precipice to plunder a Contemplative Lama. M. Huc is not unapt to indulge in a Protestant scoff at the uninstructed credulity of the Tartars, with whom, he contemptuously says, ‘la sublimité d’une doctrine est en raison directe de

son obscurité et son impenetrabilité,' and the anchorites are treated in somewhat the same tone.

'Nous avons eu des rapports assez fréquents avec ces Lamas contemplatifs, mais nous n'avons jamais pu savoir au juste ce qu'ils contemplaient là-haut, du fond de leur niche. Ils étaient eux-mêmes très incapables de s'en rendre un compte bien exact; ils avaient embrassé, nous disaient-ils, ce genre de vie, parce qu'ils avaient lu dans leur livres, que des Lamas d'une grande sainteté avaient vécu de la sorte. Au résumé, ils étaient assez bonnes gens; leur naturel était simple, paisible, et nullement farouche; ils passaient le temps à prier, et quand ils en étaient fatigués, ils trouvaient dans le sommeil un honnête délassement.'—*Huc*, vol. ii. p. 146.

With this short notice of a very peculiar class, we may now proceed to our account of the Lamanesque convents,—whether viewed as centres of political power, or of religious knowledge, of moral discipline, or of growth in art or science, beyond comparison the most remarkable institutions in Tartary. We shall, therefore, select a few passages to illustrate the growth of these powerful establishments, their external aspect, the characters of those who compose them, their religious ceremonies, their discipline and constitution. Our extracts will be principally taken from M. Huc's record of three months which he spent at the famous convent of Koun-boum.

The rise of Tartar convents is due, as in Europe, to the energy and reputation of individuals. The parallel, indeed, is sufficiently close to be worth observing. We borrow from Mr. Spence Hardy, Lingard's account of the rise of early European monasteries:—

'Wherever (at the commencement of monachism) there dwelt a monk of superior reputation for sanctity, the desire of profiting by his advice and example induced others to fix their habitations in his neighbourhood; he became their *abbas*, or spiritual father, they his voluntary subjects; and the group of separate cells which they formed around him was known to others by the name of his monastery, (so that the word which originally signified the single mansion of one solitary, now denoted a collection of such mansions.) To obtain admission into their societies no other qualification was required in the postulant than a spirit of penitence and a desire of Christian perfection. As long as this spirit continued to animate his conduct, he was exercised in the several duties of the monastic profession: if he repented of his choice, the road was open, and he was at liberty to depart. . . . It was not till a much later period, and after the decline of the original fervour, that irrevocable vows were enjoined by the policy of subsequent legislators.'—*Lingard*, (cited in *Eastern Monachism*, pp. 55, 56.)

So, *mutatis mutandis*, M. Huc of the Eastern convents:—

'Sometimes,' [he says, describing the living Budhas or Chabérons of Tartary,] 'they begin their course modestly in a little temple, surrounded only by a few disciples. Gradually their fame increases in the neighbourhood, and the little Lamaserie becomes soon an object of pilgrimages and devotion. The neighbouring Lamas, speculating on its repetition, fasten upon it their little cells; the Lamaserie extends itself year by year, and at last becomes famous in the country.'—*Huc*, vol. i. p. 278.

Before long the growing dignity of the saint requires the erection of a more sumptuous temple, and mendicants with proper religious credentials sally forth to collect the requisite funds from every part of Tartary. The mendicant is a peculiar character. He stops his horse (for no Tartar ever travels on foot) at the door of every tent which he reaches, and sounds three blasts on his sea-shell. The inmate comes forth and drops his offering in kind into the Lama's bag; much as Italian travellers may have seen a log or a cabbage dropped into the pannier of a Capuchin's ass. But the building of a temple calls for, and is met by, a more eager and unfailing profuseness. 'So simple and frugal in their dress and diet, the generosity, or rather prodigality, of these people is astonishing, when the expenses of religion and maintenance of religious worship are in question.' Every one gives,—the rich gold and silver, horses and camels,—the poor, butter, furs, or the cordage of the country. Immense sums are soon collected, and 'then in these sterile wastes edifices spring up, as if by enchantment, which for grandeur and costliness would tax the resources of the most wealthy potentates. It was, doubtless, this eager co-operation of all the faithful which raised in Europe those gigantic cathedrals which are a standing reproach to the selfishness and indifference of our own times.'

No doubt. And the aspect of an imposing Buddhist Lamaserie amidst the wilds of Tartary, must curiously represent the contrast between a massive conventual structure of the eleventh century, and the rude cottages and cultivations of our Frank or Saxon ancestors. The great temple usually rises, or rather lies, in the middle of a Lamanesque village—a cluster of white huts varied by a profusion of irregular towers and heavy pedestals surmounted by attenuated pyramids. The temple appears generally to be a striking but grotesque medley of shapeless canopies, interminable flights of steps, and colonnades supported by twisted columns. The situation is generally as well chosen as in Europe. Here is M. Huc's picturesque description of the monastery of Koun-boum.

'Its position is truly enchanting. Imagine a wide and deep ravine running up into a mountain and broken by large trees which are always peopled by crows, magpies, and yellow-beaked ravens. The amphitheatre formed by the sides of the ravine and the face of the hill is covered by the white dwellings of the Lamas, all of different sizes, all enclosed by a wall and crowned by little belvederes. Among these humble dwellings, only rich in their cleanliness and whiteness, arise here and there the gilded roofs of numerous Buddhist temples, sparkling with a thousand colours, and surrounded by elegant colonnades. The houses of the superiors are distinguished by banners which float above little hexagon towers. On every side you see mystical sentences written in large Thibetan letters, sometimes red and sometimes black; they are above all the doors, on the stones, on scraps

of cloth hoisted like flags on the little masts which stand on the terraced roofs of the houses. At almost every step you meet little sugar-loaf shaped niches, in which incense, sweet smelling wood, and cypress leaves are burnt. What is most striking, however, is to see a whole people of Lamas clothed in red, with yellow mitres on their heads, threading the numerous streets of the monastery. Their gait is usually grave; silence is not prescribed, yet they speak little, and always in a low voice. It is only at the hours of public worship, or when the schools meet or break up, that many of them are abroad. During the rest of the day the Lamas keep their cells pretty closely; only some are to be seen descending by winding paths to the bottom of the ravine, and climbing up again with difficulty with a long barrel of water on their backs. You meet also some strangers, who have come to worship, or to visit Lamas of their acquaintance.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 93—95.

The missionaries' account of their arrival at this spot is an almost touching record of the first impression produced upon them by this imposing establishment.

'When we were about a *li* distance from the monastery, we met four Lamas, friends of Sandara, who had come to meet us. Their religious dress, the red scarf in which they were wrapped, their yellow cap, in the shape of a mitre, their modesty, their grave words and low voices made a singular impression upon us; and brought to us as it were an odour of religious and conventual life. It was past nine in the evening when we reached the first dwellings of the monastery. That the deep silence which reigned around might not be broken, the Lamas made our driver stop, and filled with straw the little bells which hung to the horses' collars. We then proceeded slowly, and without speaking a single word, through the still and deserted streets of this great Lamanesque city. The moon was already set, but the sky was so clear, and the stars so brilliant, that we could easily discern the little houses of the Lamas scattered on the sides of the mountain, and the grandiose and fantastic shapes of the Buddhist temples which stood forth against the sky, like gigantic phantoms. What most struck us was the solemn and majestic silence which reigned in all parts of the monastery, only broken by the irregular barkings of some dogs half asleep, and by the dull and melancholy sound of a sea-shell, which marked at proper intervals the watches of the night; you might fancy you heard the gloomy song of the osprey. At last we reached Sandara's small house.'—*Ibid.* pp. 84, 85.

On their arrival they were overwhelmed with kindness. They were first taken to call in form upon their future landlord.

'Le Lama nous fit asseoir sur un tapis, nous offrit une tasse de thé au lait, et nous dit en langue Mongole, qu'il était heureux que des étrangers venus de si loin—que des Lamas du ciel d'occident eussent daigné jeter leurs regards sur sa chétive habitation . . . S'il eût compris le Français, c'eût été le cas de répondre: Monsieur, il n'y a pas de quoi . . . Mais comme il fallait parler Mongol, nous lui dîmes qu'en effet nous étions de bien loin, que cependant on retrouvait, en quelque sorte, sa patrie, quand on avait le bonheur de rencontrer une hospitalité comme la sienne . . . Après avoir pris une tasse de thé, et causé un instant de la France, de Rome, du Pape et des Cardinaux, (!) nous nous levâmes pour aller visiter la demeure qui nous était destinée.'—*Ibid.* pp. 88, 89.

Very comfortable they found it, and they immediately took possession, aided by all the neighbours. Everybody took

pleasure in carrying their baggage, in sweeping their rooms, in lighting their fires and arranging the stables for their cattle. The whole concluded as etiquette required, by a feast from the landlord.

‘How powerful is religion over the human heart! even when it is false and wanders ever so far from its true object. What a contrast between these Lamas, so generous, so hospitable, so brotherly towards strangers, and the Chinese—that nation of shopkeepers, with their cold and money-loving hearts, who sell to the traveller even a glass of cold water. The warmth of our reception at the lamaserie of Koun-boum carried back our recollections to those convents raised by the hospitality of our religious ancestors, which were in other times so many hostelrys where the traveller and the poor man was sure to find refreshment for his body, and consolation for his soul.’—*Ibid.* p. 89.

The short sketches we have of the neighbours among whom they were now placed, are various and life-like. Opposite is the lean, withered, and tottering old Akayé, who had made a good fortune in the management of the convent, but had spent it all in works of charity and loans which had never been repaid. He could neither read nor write, but had always his rosary in his hand, and was always muttering in his cell some forms of prayer. ‘The man had an excellent heart, but nobody took much notice of him—he was old and ruined.’ Next to him lives a miserly Chinese Lama, with a great country reputation, but who had found his level at Koun-boum, with his well-natured pickle of a pupil, always eating too much of his master’s butter, wasting his candle, and mimicking the big stutterer who lived over the way, a shy, well-meaning creature, who wanted to be at once a good Christian and a good Buddhist, ‘et dont la lourde et épaisse figure l’accusait de faire dans son étroit réduit, une assez forte consommation de beurre. Nous ne pouvions jamais le voir mettre le nez à la porte de sa case sans songer à ce rat de La Fontaine qui, par devotion, s’était retiré dans un fromage de Hollande.’ And last, not least, should be noticed the adroit, active, adventurous, proud, overbearing charlatan, Sandara—their tutor and tormentor, during their stay at the convent—and a unique specimen, as far as they could see, of a Lama who disbelieved his creed. These individual specimens illustrate the variety of character which will be found under the most tranquil and monotonous exterior; but M. Huc furnishes us with a more general estimate of the class. It will have been seen that the characteristic demeanour of the Lama is kind, grave, and modest. Nor probably is this mere surface kindness. Gravity is an element of their character. But so are volatility and violence, which burst forth on occasions with an oriental inconsistency. They reflect to the full the thoughtless and improvident character of their nation. If

they make money by their professions, some give it away in charity, like Akayé; some hoard it, like the miserly Chinese; but the majority throw it away with little loss of time in gauds and finery. Some, again, are mere charlatans and adventurers, (of whom more fully hereafter,) and the brethren appear by no means incapable of resorting to fisticuffs for the settlement of internal disputes, nor, with all their superstitious regard for animal life, of rising in arms when their property is carried away by brigands, or one of their ecclesiastical dignitaries is suspected to have been poisoned, or known to have been arrested, by the Chinese. But with all this, they are, as a mass, in earnest about their religion. Among the many Lamas of Koun-boum, who visited the Missionaries in crowds every day, and always talked about religion, 'we found not one,' says M. Huc, 'of the sceptical cast of Sandara; all appeared to us sincerely religious, and full of good faith.' But, what is very curious, they appear with this to have united a warm and friendly curiosity respecting Christianity. 'Many of them,' says M. Huc, 'attached a high importance to the knowledge 'and study of the truth; they often came to pray for instruction in our holy religion.' We have had occasion to remark this at Lassa. Devotedly—perhaps fanatically—attached to his own religion, the Lama is singularly tolerant of others. The irreligious Chinese, Buddhist in name, but in fact a mere unbeliever, is the severe and jealous persecutor; the devout Tartar or Thibetan is the generous and open-hearted friend of the Christian. 'Oh! la sainte doctrine.' 'Oh! les saintes règles de l'Occident!' are their exclamations when they are first informed of the elementary truths and practices of Christianity.

But the circumstances under which the missionaries left Koun-boum exhibit more remarkably than any general statement the mixture of correct regularity with courteous and tolerant hospitality which prevailed in the convent. The missionaries wore habitually the yellow robe, which is the secular or every-day dress of the Lama. But it was absolutely required by the rules of Koun-boum, that all residents should wear the red dress of ceremony. For more than three months our Missionaries were allowed to infringe this rule. At last, however, the authorities felt obliged to remonstrate, and our friends were requested to conform. They replied that, not being Buddhists, they could not conscientiously adopt the sacred, or ceremonial dress of Buddhism; but that, if the rule were inflexible, they were ready to depart. The authorities, after some delay, and with full knowledge of the Missionaries' teaching, replied that the rule could no longer be dispensed with, 'qu'on était peiné que notre sublime et sainte religion ne nous permît pas de

nous y conformer,' and, therefore, that they must leave the monastery; but that comfortable quarters, with full liberty to dress as they pleased, would be provided for them at the subsidiary convent of Tchogortan—the 'maison de campagne' of the medical faculty. Thither they were accordingly conducted with the greatest kindness, and there they were housed with such comforts as the case admitted of, until they found it convenient to proceed on their travels.

But to proceed with our description of the place and its practices. The Lamas monopolize all the knowledge and science that are to be found in Tartary. More especially are they the sculptors, painters, and architects of the country; and their whole powers are exhausted on the adornment of their temples. The exterior of these we have already described. Within, images abound—not, as some Budhists maintain, as being themselves divine, but as mementos of divinity. The sculpture of the Lamas, like that of our mediæval artists, is better than their painting. The idols are accordingly well formed, and the temple is covered with a profusion of every sort of carving, executed with astonishing truth and spirit. In one of their exhibitions—the Feast of Flowers—at which our travellers were present, every kind of human and animal life was modelled, strange to say, in butter, not only with surprising accuracy, but with considerable ease and even grandeur. The face of Budha, in particular, is described as 'full of nobleness and majesty.' The paintings are inferior; but M. Huc's description of them would remind us, in many respects, of early Christian art. 'The grotesque,' he says, 'predominates, and the personages, except the Budhas, have usually a monstrous and diabolical appearance. The dresses seem never to have been made for the persons who are bundled up in them. You would say that the limbs which are hidden by the drapery are broken and dislocated.' Yet even paintings are to be found which astonished the French Missionaries, 'not only by the purity and grace of their design, but by their rich colouring, and the expression of their faces.'

On a level with the principal altar is the throne of the living Budha whom most important monasteries have for their Grand Lama. Here is a description of his costume:—

'In the person of the Grand Lama there was little to remark. Not so in his costume, which was point for point that of our bishops. He wore on his head a yellow mitre, in his right hand was a long rod in the shape of a crosier, and on his shoulders a violet silk cloak fastened over the chest by a clasp, and in every particular resembling a cope.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 101.

The other Lamas have their set places. The blowing of a shell collects them for religious worship, which commences on the ringing of a bell. Each Lama first murmurs a low prayer;

a short silence succeeds, and then on the second ringing of a bell begins an antiphonal psalm-singing—'une psalmodie à deux chœurs sur un ton grave et mélodieux,' for which it seems the short versicles which compose the Thibetan prayers are peculiarly adapted. Thibetan, we say, for the worship is everywhere conducted in the language of their religious metropolis. But lest this imposing worship should be without an infusion of characteristic extravagance, it is interrupted at fixed intervals by a kind of *charivari* of bells, cymbals, drums, shells, trumpets, whistles, &c., during which 'chaque musicien joue son instrument avec une espèce de furie—c'est à qui produira le plus de bruit et le plus de desordre.'

In point of discipline, there are two great differences between the laws of a Lamaserie and of a Christian monastery;—first, that every one is apparently at liberty to leave a Lamaserie when he pleases, and—unless expelled for any misdemeanour—return to it; and next, that there is no strict community of property. Offerings are made, and the surrounding pastures belong to the convent; but every Lama may make and keep property obtained by the exercise of his profession, or otherwise. The difference, therefore, between rich and poor, which in Europe existed only between convent and convent, or between abbot and brethren,¹ exists in Tartary between all the different members of the community.

If, however, the Lamas are not obliged to remain in the convent, they are obliged, while they do remain, to conform to its rules by certain constable Lamas, who circulate, in dresses of black and grey, somewhat like university proctors, through the lecture rooms by day and the streets by night, and enforce a severe and watchful discipline by means of a powerful whip, (a method now antiquated in our universities,) a stout bar of iron, and, in extreme cases, the brand. As an university, the convent too has its faculties; they are four: 1. Mysticism and hagiography; 2. Religious ceremonial; 3. Medicine; 4. Prayer. It has also its disputations, which reminded M. Huc of the mediæval schools in their omnigenous minuteness. The conqueror is rewarded by the privilege of riding his opponent pic-a-back round the convent. Their friend Sandara obtained this distinction in a controversy which had reference apparently to a chicken's gizzard. In the mode of instruction pursued, the only noticeable feature is a remarkably liberal use of the stick, which the pupils themselves appear to consider, not so much an instrument of punishment, as an indispensable method of fixing prayers in the memory.

¹ Vide Joscelin de Brakelond *passim*.

The constitution of these monasteries is a matter not only of religious but of political importance. In Tartary it is quasi-monarchical, not unlike that of Kennaquhair. The Grand Lama, or living Budha, usually a Thibetan, regulates the religious ceremonial, and like a Lucretian deity receives the adoration of the faithful. But the Mongol superior, a kind of *maire du Palais*, a native, and usually of royal extraction, is charged with the practical administration, the order and police of the convent, and, in the phrase of M. Huc, is allowed to govern, while the other is content to reign.

The election of a new Grand Lama—the centre, as it were, of the religious life of the community—is one of the most curious and characteristic practices related by M. Huc. When a Grand Lama dies,—or, in their phrase, departs,—the monastery, though anxious and excited, is not in mourning. They know that the spirit has merely migrated into another human form, and that their business is to find him out. With this view they fast, they pray, they watch omens, and consult diviners. A rainbow is his principal sign, and by its date, its position, the clearness of its colours, and the mode of its disappearance, the soothsayer is able to tell them where their idol is to be found. Sometimes, however, the saint or divinity saves them this trouble.

‘As soon as he has performed his metamorphosis in Thibet, and before an ordinary infant could pronounce a word, he reveals himself. “It is I,” he says in a tone of authority, “It is I, who am the Grand Lama—the living Budha of such a temple; let them conduct me to my old Lamaserie; I am its immortal head.” The prodigious infant, having thus spoken, they hasten to inform the Lamas of the indicated *soumè* that their Chaberon is born in such and such a place, and they summon them, on his authority, to come and invite him thither.’—*Ibid*, vol. i. p. 280.

Forthwith the Tartars are in movement,—kings, princes, mandarins and people pour forth to convoy the young Lama, who makes a point, it seems, of effecting his new birth in some remote and almost inaccessible country. Sometimes they are plundered; sometimes they perish from cold; sometimes they are driven back to their own country; but some of them at last succeed in appearing before the miraculous child.

‘The young Chaberon, however, is not worshipped and proclaimed Grand Lama without a preliminary examination. A solemn assembly is held, at which the living Budha is publicly and minutely catechised; they ask him the name and particulars of the monastery of which he claims the presidency; they question him upon the habits of the dead Lama, and upon the circumstances of his death. Then they put before him different books of prayer, pieces of furniture, tea-pots, cups, &c. He must point out among all these, whatever belonged to him in his former life. Usually this child, at most but five or six years old, is victorious in all these trials. He answers exactly all the questions put to him, and gives, without em-

barrassment, the inventory of his goods. "Here," says he, "are the books of prayer I have been accustomed to use. Here is the varnished saucer, in which I used to have my tea," and so on. Doubtless, the Mongols are often duped by those who are interested in making a Grand Lama out of this child. We think, however, that on both sides, all this is often done in good faith. From the testimony which we took care to obtain from trustworthy persons, it seems certain that all that is said of the Chabérons cannot be disposed of as if it were illusion and trick. A merely human philosophy would doubtless reject such facts, or treat them, without hesitation, as Lamanesque imposture. For us, Catholic Missionaries, we think that the father of lies, who formerly deceived our first parents in paradise, continues his system of falsehood. He who had the power to support Simon Magus in the air, can well at this time speak to men by means of a child, in order to keep up the faith of his worshippers.

'The title of the living Budha being established, he is led in triumph to the *soumé* of which he is again to become the Grand Lama. Along his road all is astir; the Tartars come in crowds to prostrate themselves in his path, and to present their offerings. As soon as he arrives in the Lamaserie, he is placed upon the altar; and then, kings, princes, mandarins, lamas, all the Tartars, from the richest to the poorest, come to bend before this child, whom they have sought with such pains in the depths of Thibet, and whose demoniacal possession excites universal deference, wonder, and enthusiasm.—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 281—283.

Two of these false divinities our travellers saw—one a poor boy who seemed oppressed by a sense of his imposture, the other a restless good-natured kind of man, who condescended to visit them in their room at a Tartar hotel, rather to the scandal of his attendants.

'A breviary, which lay beside us, immediately fixed his attention. He asked if he might examine it. Being answered in the affirmative, he took it in his hands, admired the binding and gilt edges, opened it, and turned over the leaves—then shut it, and lifted it with solemnity to his forehead, saying, "It is your prayer-book, we should always honour and respect prayers." Then, he added, "Your religion and ours are so," and so saying, he placed against each other the tips of his forefingers. "Yes," we replied, "our creeds are hostile; we do not disguise that the object of all our travels and labours is to substitute our prayers for those which your monasteries use." "I know it," he said with a smile, "I have long known it." Then he again took the breviary, and asked us to explain the numerous engravings which it contained. Nothing that we said seemed to astonish him,—only, when we had explained the picture of the Crucifixion, he shook his head with an expression of pity, and joined his hands, and lifted them to his forehead. Having gone through all the engravings, he took the breviary from our hands, and again touched his head with it. Then he arose, and saluting us courteously, left the room.—*Ibid.* vol. ii., pp. 39, 40.

They returned the visit, and were received by the Chaberon with friendliness. The fact was, he seemed full of curiosity, and very glad to see them. His words and manner, they say, were full of affability—there was in his face '*une bonhomie étonnante*,' yet there was a certain strangeness of expression which they could not get over.

'We imagined that we saw in his eyes something of the infernal and diabolical. This peculiarity apart, which arose perhaps from certain prepossessions of our own, we should have found him extremely amiable.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 42.

As many of these Grand Lamas are (like those in Thibet) princes as well as priests, it may be imagined that they have considerable capacities for making themselves troublesome. But of all in Tartary, far the most formidable appears to be the Guison Tamba. This potentate presides over the monastery of the Great Kouren, containing in itself, and its immediate dependencies, no less than 30,000 Lamas, and is at once obeyed and worshipped throughout the large tracts inhabited by the Khalkas, the countrymen of the great Genghis Khan, and apparently the most warlike (at least in aspiration) of the Tartars. Among them the Guison Tamba is *par excellence* 'the saint.' If you ask a Khalka his country, 'I am a disciple,' he says with pride, 'of the holy Kouren.' He depends, he will tell you, on the Guison Tamba alone, 'and not on the *black man* who sits on the throne of Pekin.' Such a personage is of course an object of considerable jealousy to the rulers of China. He is always watched, and sometimes poisoned. Once in the centre of his own dominions he was summarily put to death for omitting to rise in presence of the great emperor Khang-hi; but it nearly cost the lives of the monarch and his suite. By dint, however, of courage and adroitness, they escaped, and the emperor lost no time in providing against a danger which had so nearly destroyed him. His precautions were characteristic. His enemy was by hypothesis indestructible. By cutting off the man's head he had but operated a transmigration, for a fresh Guison Tamba was already in the field. To dethrone him was more than the most bold and sagacious of Chinese emperors could venture on, and his sovereignty was accordingly recognised over the Great Kouren. But in so doing the emperor took a course not unknown to European potentates. He brought the supreme Pontiff to bear upon the enemy, and in order to break the connexion between Khalka nationality and its representative, decreed, somewhat whimsically, with the concurrence of the Talè-Lama, that after every death the Guison-Tamba should be under an obligation to transmigrate into Thibet. The order has been scrupulously obeyed. But the Khalka Lamas wear to this day a black stripe on their collars, in memory of the Chinese sacrilege. And the saint, it is said, is always caught young, and carefully imbued in the course of his education with the spirit of independence, and an angry recollection of the outrage inflicted upon him in his former life by the *black man* of Pekin.

This is but a specimen of the dangers to which the Chinese Empire is exposed from the 'associated priesthood.' It is provided for partly, as we have said, by diplomacy at head quarters, where, as we have seen, the Chinese influence is rapidly becoming preponderant; but partly also by endeavouring to attach the Lamas to the existing state of things by grants of privileges and money. This policy is supposed to have the double effect of attaching the ruling class to the government, and of arresting the growth of a dangerous population by increasing the unmarried part of it. But palliatives of this kind at last lose their effect, and the book before us certainly suggests the expectation that the day will come, expected alike by Tartar and Thibetan—and even, it would seem, by the Chinese themselves, when a religious leader of power and ambition will avail himself of the simple enthusiasm of Tartary, or the martial and independent fanaticism of Thibet, or of both, to annihilate the system of cunning contrivance by which the authority of Pekin is now sustained, and either to appropriate or break to pieces the great Chinese Empire. In the former contingency we might probably see a repetition of the history of the Mantchous—another evidence that the intelligence and enterprise of a nation, even when directed to mere money-getting civilization, is more than able to compensate for the inefficiency of their rulers. From the second, results might follow most important to the prospects of Christianity in those parts which were emancipated from the pinching dominion of China.

Several points remain which we could wish to have noticed: the Tartar love for religious pilgrimages—a singularly close reproduction of mediæval Europe,—the legends of saints who have been suspended in or wafted through the air by force of their devotion—the formula¹ of the *mani*—the expectations (already alluded

¹ The words of this formula are 'Om, mani, padmé houm !' M. Hue's translation is, 'Oh ! the jewel in the lotus ! Amen.' This is the prayer which the Thibetans recite on their rosaries, and their devotion to it is astonishing. Some persons even keep Lamas in their pay, for the purpose of travelling through the country, and engraving it on rocks. The following is the Regent's explanation of it. 'Animated beings are divided into six classes,—Angels, demons, men, 'beasts, birds, and reptiles; these correspond to the six syllables of the formula. 'Animated beings, according to their merit or demerit, pass continually through these classes, till they have attained perfection, when they are absorbed and lost in the great essence of Budha, that is, in the great universal soul from which all souls emanate, and in which all souls, after their temporary migrations, must mingle and re-unite. Animated beings, according to their respective classes, have their peculiar means for sanctifying themselves, for rising into a superior class, for obtaining perfection, and finally absorption. Men who recite very often and very devoutly "Om, mani, padmé houm !" escape falling back after their death into any of the six classes corresponding to the six syllables of the formula, and obtain the fulness of being, by their absorption into the eternal and universal soul of Budha.' We suppose, therefore, that the formula may be described as

to) of a sanguinary battle, a kind of Armageddon, between the great parties of good and evil, with first a persecution then a triumph of the cause of religion—the derivation of the human race from three brothers, with a variety of other coincidences with Christianity in general, or with the peculiarities of Romanism. But there is one feature far too prominent to be omitted in any sketch of Tartar religion—the mass of alleged miracles by which the people are still amused or cheated. These are generally whimsical, sometimes childish, and sometimes revolting. Of the whole mass of trickery, Lamas are the preachers and agents. It is they who frame horoscopes, exorcise diseases, handle red-hot iron, command empty vessels to fill themselves with water, or rip up their own bowels and instantaneously close the wound. Of the superstitions thus propagated, some are evidently accepted with entire faith by devout and well-meaning Lamas, who imagine with the most undoubting confidence that they are repelling brigands by setting up with much ceremony and many prayers a ‘Pyramid of Peace;’ that they are laying up treasure in heaven by grinding out prayers in a prayer-mill; and that in scattering little paper horses to the wind they are furnishing a supply of animals to distressed travellers.

Sometimes, however, the impostures are unmistakeable and impudent, and among these the Lamanesque treatment of disease deserves especial notice. All disease, according to the Lamas, is diabolical possession. A ‘Tchutgour’ has taken possession of the patient. He is first assailed by medicine, in regard of which it may be recorded, as an index to the state of Tartar science, that it is considered indifferent whether the patient swallow the medicine or the prescription. ‘Avaler le nom du remède, ou le remède lui-même, disent les Tartares, cela revient absolument au même.’ If the devil yields at once to this, it is well; if not, he must be besieged with prayers suitable to his quality. The dignity of the Tchutgour is generally proportionate to the rank and wealth of the energumen. Poor men are invariably possessed by trumpery devils, requiring slight liturgical treatment. Rich men are sure to be inhabited by a mighty spirit, one of the lords of the nether world, ‘et comme il n’est pas décent qu’un grand Tchutgour voyage comme un diabolotin, on doit lui préparer de beaux habits, un beau chapeau, une belle paire de bottes, et surtout un jeune et vigoureux cheval.’ Sometimes he is even unreasonable enough to require horses for his family and servants. After these attentions, which are represented as indispensable, the cere-

being in some way or other an aspiration after the Buddhist heaven, though it is difficult to make out that the particular words have any definite meaning in the mouths of those who recite them.

monial commences, which usually results in killing or curing the patient. In either case, however, the operation is considered as successful—according to the prevailing ideas of Lamanesque success. In either case the ejection of the Tchut-gour is complete, though in one the patient may have been put to the temporary inconvenience of a transmigration. The ceremony does not always confine itself to prayers; more violent persuasives are at times resorted to. In one case, where M. Huc himself witnessed the operation, a fever-devil was burnt in effigy, and the patient led in procession with a grotesque accompaniment of clappings, howlings, and every species of musical and unmusical clatter that could be produced for the occasion. In this case the woman was cured without the necessity of transmigration, though at a considerable expense in respect of provisions and apparatus.

The better class of Lamas disown these absurdities. ‘When a man is sick,’ said the honest superior of a convent to the missionaries, ‘it is good to pray, for Budha is the lord of life and death. It is he who governs the transmigration of all living beings. It is also well to take remedies; for the great gift of medicinal herbs is also from Budha. That the devil may inhabit a sick man is credible; but that in order to prevail upon him to depart, he must be furnished with clothes and a horse, this is a mere figment of ignorant and swindling Lamas.’ Nor do the conjuring Lamas stand well with their more thoughtful brethren. It is not thought respectable for a priest to be able to lay open his own entrails and shut them up again, as if they were a mere cupboard. The conjurors are a loose set, and their practices are considered revolting, if not impious; but they amuse the people, and feed a belief in the supernatural, which, if corrupt in its developments, is the foundation of much that is good and much that is useful to the hierarchy. And so, though partially disavowed, these performances are not prohibited by the ecclesiastical authorities, and are even exhibited at set times “*con approb.*” M. Huc does not take upon himself to suggest any European analogy to this mixture of sense and religion, with credulity, imposture and connivance at imposture—the connivance of men who are not quite honest enough to put down what they think it profitable that others should believe; who contrive to patronize without committing themselves—who wish their system to be all things to all men—reasonable and philosophical to the intelligent foreigner, coarse and effective to the uninformed people. A Protestant imagination will supply the gap only too freely; and perhaps a parallel might be furnished from what has been already quoted in these pages.

But M. Huc professes to have inquired into many of the wonders of Tartary, and to have satisfied himself that some of them really could not have been effected without supernatural intervention. We have already seen his view of the election of Grand Lamas. But this was founded on report only, though vouched, as he conceived, by trustworthy authority. In one case, however, he speaks as an eye-witness, and very curious his statements are. On the spot where Tsong-Kaba, the modern reformer of Buddhism, at the age of three years, cut off his hair, and devoted himself to a religious life, grows a miraculous tree, marked, it is said, on every leaf with characters of the sacred language of Thibet, and diffusing around it an exquisite perfume. It is to be seen at the convent already mentioned, which owes to it the name of Koun-boum, or ten thousand pictures. It is covered with a silver dome, the offering of the great Emperor Khang-hi. Our missionaries examined it, and here is their account of what they saw:

'Yes, this tree still lives; and we had heard it too often spoken of during our journey, not to have become somewhat impatient to see it. At the foot of the mountain on which the monastery is built, and not far from the principal Buddhist temple, is a large square enclosure of brick. We entered this vast court, and examined at our leisure the wonderful tree, some of whose branches we had seen from the outside. We looked first at the leaves with eager curiosity, and we were aghast with astonishment at seeing actually on each of them very well formed Thibetan characters, of a green colour, sometimes darker, sometimes lighter than the leaf itself. Our first thought was to suspect the Lamas of imposture; but after examining it all with the most minute attention, we were unable to discover the least fraud. The characters seemed to us to make part of the leaf, like the veins and fibres; they do not always choose the same place; sometimes they are at the point, or in the middle of the leaf, sometimes at the bottom or on the sides; the youngest leaves show the characters in a half formed state; the bark of the trunk, and of the branches, which peels off somewhat like the plane-tree, is similarly loaded with characters. If you break off a piece of the old bark, you see on the new the indeterminate form of the characters, which are already beginning to germinate; and, what is singular, they often differ from those above them. We sought everywhere, but in vain, for some trace of imposture; the perspiration stood in drops on our foreheads. Abler inquirers may perhaps be able to give a satisfactory explanation of this singular tree; for ourselves, we must give it up. People will doubtless smile at our ignorance, but for that we care not, if they do not suspect the truth of our account.

'The tree of ten thousand pictures appeared very old; its trunk, which three men could hardly embrace, is not more than eight feet high: the branches do not grow upwards, but feather, and are very thick; some are withered and falling from old age; the leaves are evergreen, the wood of a reddish colour, and of an exquisite smell, something like that of cinnamon. The Lamas told us that during the summer, about the eighth moon, it had extremely beautiful red flowers. They also assured us that there was no other tree of the kind in existence; that people had tried to multiply it by seeds and grafts in many monasteries of Thibet, but every attempt had been fruitless.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 113—115.

But though M. Huc declines to put forward any explanation of this phenomenon, he has, as we have seen, a general theory on the subject of Buddhist miracles. They are the work of the devil, to support the Buddhist religion. The father of lies works them to keep alive the faith of his worshippers. M. Huc applies the same theory to the Lamas who hack themselves to pieces, and he has even preserved the form of invocation—telling, as he conceives, its own story—by which a friend of his was accustomed (not in his presence, however) to fill an empty glass with water. Whoever is the agent addressed, the conjuror is certainly on easy, not to say familiar terms with him.

‘I know thee; thou knowest me. Come, my old friend, do what I ask you. Bring water, and fill the vessel that I present to thee. To fill a vessel with water, what is that for thy great power? I know that thou chargest high for a vessel of water. No matter; do what I ask, and fill this vessel that I present to thee. We will settle accounts hereafter. At the proper time thou shalt take all thy dues.’—*Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 310, 311.

In dealing, however, with this theory, it is very material to observe that the Buddhist religion, in favour of which this diabolical interference is supposed to take place, appears to be very much better than any thing else which the people would get instead of it. It stands opposed, not to Christianity, but to the hard and selfish unbelief which M. Huc imputes to the Chinese. It appears, if he is to be believed, to humanize and elevate those whom it influences at all; it teaches them to admire and practise brotherly kindness, to control the appetites, to dwell on the thought of God and another life. Everywhere, indeed, it is tainted with falsehood and imperfection; but placed by the side of what it supersedes, it is good and true. On the other hand, when brought into the presence of Christianity, it assumes the attitude, not of a fanatical enemy, not even of a jealous rival, but of a curious and respectful inquirer. It is the sceptical mandarin who persecutes, the devout Lama welcomes and considers Christianity. If such power were given to the evil spirit, he might well exert it to crumble and deface the fragments of truth which still appear majestically amidst the superstitions of Buddhism; he might well employ himself in leading its votaries from lofty thoughts and kindly actions, into puerile and grotesque superstition. He might well attempt to debase their conception of what was divine by familiarising them with the idea of supernatural absurdity. The religion, in short, and its circumstances being what M. Huc describes them, the evil spirit might well occupy himself in corrupting, but scarcely, one would think, in supporting it.

Apparent inversions of the order of nature which are either unconnected with any religious system, or appear to vouch for

one which we believe to be false or imperfect, form a standing difficulty to men of educated minds, as they are apt to be the objects of a greedy appetite in the unlearned. We do not mean that we see the slightest philosophical difficulty in miracles as such. We cannot see any such difficulty. Applying to this question the only feeble analogy which is within our reach, we do not find that finite beings consider themselves precluded from correcting the irregularities or controlling the course of what may be called their own creations. A watchmaker who has made a clock does not merely leave it to follow the law of its construction; he does not even content himself with that stated interference which is necessary to keep it in motion; that is to say, with winding it up at fixed intervals. On the contrary, if it gains or loses, he interferes arbitrarily and at his own discretion to set or regulate it. So of a labourer who sets up a beehive, or of a monarch who founds a colony. Neither of them holds himself tied to any principle of non-intervention. They interfere when they please and as they please, either for their own benefit, or for the better regulation of what they have called into existence. All analogies, therefore, within our reach, (whatever their value on such a subject,) would incline us to expect from the Author of nature such extraordinary interferences in the conduct of His world as may be useful to keep it in the course which he has assigned to it. Of course, if it be assumed at starting that nature is regulated by nothing but a system of fixed laws, it is a contradiction in terms to assert that those laws are ever interfered with. Or again, if it be assumed that there is no experience, (*i.e.* no historical evidence) of miracles, it is a contradiction in terms to assert that there is. If the abstract argument against miracles resolves itself into either of these statements, it is a mere *petitio principii*; if it means more, we are wholly unable to understand its force. But we Christians, to whom God has given certain conceptions of His own dignity, goodness and power, find a wholly distinct source of perplexity in apparently supernatural phenomena, which either in respect of their own character, or in respect of the system with which they are connected, and for which they appear to be the vouchers, conflict with the notions which we have obtained of Him, and on which our whole system of religious belief is based. In dealing with such phenomena we are at once launched on a sea of conjecture. Some rays of light we may extract from Scripture; some from human science; some from every-day experience; some from the dicta of good and thoughtful men; but after all, we do but grope, and can only arrive at a dogmatical conclusion by arbitrarily dismissing from our mind considerations which we cannot satisfactorily dispose of by reason.

We have unmistakeable Scripture authority for ascribing certain phenomena of this world to the agency of devils, who during our Lord's life not only assumed the form of ordinary diseases, but evinced a superhuman knowledge of His person and character, and were treated by Him as living and individual spirits. And no doubt, having arrived at these two great superhuman causes, the Author of truth, and the father of lies, there is a kind of intellectual satisfaction in viewing all the inexplicable phenomena of the world, not only as flowing directly from one or other of these agencies, but as being in one case signs from the Almighty to guarantee the truth of the system in which they appear, in the other, artifices of the devil to oppress and mislead mankind. We seem to be dealing clearly, boldly, and sufficiently with alleged results, by referring them to established causes. On such causes it is satisfactory to lean, and we are tempted to force all phenomena under one or the other of them. And yet we are surrounded by facts which warn us against such precipitancy. There is a wide intermediate field—not less real because we cannot dogmatize about it. High authorities have believed in the divine origin of miracles, which yet are connected with a false or imperfect system. S. Augustine ascribes the wonders which in his day were wrought at the shrines (*memoriæ*) of heretical saints, to God's blessing on the faith of the people. And thoughtful men have believed that even in the Delphic oracles, and other wonders of paganism, the hand of the True God was discernible, so directing the powers of the spiritual and physical world, that they should testify in the midst of darkness to the existence at least of a religion, and to the truth of those moral laws which He has appointed. Nor is such a view without some sanction from Scripture. The evil spirits of Judea cried out, 'Jesus, thou son of God, art thou come hither to torment us before our time?' 'What have we to do with Thee?' The spirit of divination (not '*πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον*,' but '*πνεῦμα Πύθωνος*,' the 'Pythian spirit,') at Philippi, constantly proclaimed of the Apostles; 'These men are the servants of the Most High God, which show *unto us* the way of salvation.' The contrast is very remarkable, even if we are unable to determine its precise significance. There are other considerations of a different kind, which cannot be dismissed in dealing with this subject. It is extremely difficult to assign limits to the powers of imposture. The feats of an ordinary juggler are such that most of us would unhesitatingly pronounce them to be impossible, if it were not notorious that they were publicly performed every day, and that the tricks could be learnt for a few guineas. Far more astonishing are those phe-

nomena of mesmerism which are established beyond a doubt, though running wholly counter to the laws of nature, as hitherto known to us. The clearly authenticated phenomena of concurrent dreams are, according to our ideas, too fantastic to be ascribed to supernatural agency,—yet too strangely minute in their coincidence to be easily accounted for by any other known cause. Wesley's ghost and Highland second-sight remain on record, with enough evidence to be puzzling, not to speak of a variety of other phenomena which it is almost equally difficult to explain or to explain away. It appears to us, therefore, that on questions of this kind we must be content to be very much at sea; and our Lord's prediction that among the perplexities of the latter days the 'lying wonders' would be such, as 'if it were possible to deceive the very elect,' though no doubt directly pointed against the miracles of Antichrist, yet enforces upon us strongly our general liability to error when dealing with this subject. We think, therefore, that even if M. Huc were a more cautious and critical investigator than he is, we might fairly pause before either adopting his explanation of the wonders which he records, or offering any of our own.

We will conclude by shortly recapitulating the main points of that strange analogy which in the latter part of this article we have attempted to illustrate. Budhism is the Catholicism, the 'universal' religion, of heathen Asia; surpassing in antiquity and numerical importance Christianity itself. Spreading through a variety of kingdoms, and apparently varying its character according to the national peculiarities which it encounters, it yet centres in an ecclesiastical personage who unites a small temporal sovereignty with a religious supremacy vaster than that of the Pope himself. Resting upon this centre, the religion is supported and propagated by an immense body of unmarried priests—partly attached to families, (the nomad form of a parish,) partly detached from the world as hermits or wanderers, and partly collected in religious communities, which are bound together by an imposing if not severe discipline, under their respective heads, and comprise the strength of the religion and the learning of the country. Its theology is founded on an ancient revelation, round which a traditional development has accumulated, partly from a series of semi-judicial decisions, partly by the continuous and uniform workings of a multitude of subtle, enthusiastic, and imaginative minds. In the department of theology it reflects strangely, though delusively, the Christian doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity, of Heaven and Hell, the Ten Commandments of the Mosaic Law, and often the language or

sentiments of Scripture. Its philosophy is careful, elaborate, and appears to possess a scriptural kind of depth and completeness. In morals it inculcates the vanity of all things earthly, and the duty of universal benevolence, and proceeds to hold up as the highest object of human existence a life of continued religious meditation, fed by the most rigorous and unflinching asceticism. Its saints are of this deeply mortified class, and the anecdotes which record their virtues, their ascetic feats, and their supernatural powers, are at once strangely noble, touching, and absurd. Similarly, the rules into which their morality develops itself, display alternately a piercing depth and force, a careful and purpose-like exactitude, and a mere trifling particularity. Their ceremonial is conducted in magnificent temples crowded with images—the objects of worship more or less gross, according as the worshippers are more or less refined in their ideas of Deity. Their dignitaries wear the dress of a Roman Catholic Bishop, and their worship is conducted in a foreign language, and in a solemn melody chanted by alternate choirs of priests. The imaginations of the people are fed, and their devotion kept alive, by a multitude of the wildest legends, by processions, pilgrimages, and by daily recurring miracles, which the authorities appear sometimes to disclaim, sometimes to sanction, and everywhere to tolerate.

Yet, with all this similarity in the results and apparatus of religion, it is really doubtful whether the existence of a Deity is part of the Buddhist creed. It has appropriated and developed with wonderful vigour the captivating circumstances of religion. It is also studded with those corruptions which result from the determination to make religion all things to all men—coarse and melo-dramatic to the gross-minded populace—subtle and ingenious to the keen philosopher—rigorous and uncompromising to the enthusiast. But its deficiency is nothing less than the idea which is the first and fundamental idea of all religion—that of an everlasting and ever-present Deity, knowing all things, caring for all things, and always watchfully interfering for the good of his creatures.

We leave to historians the task of tracing the origin of this phenomenon—its connexion, if any, with Judaism or early Christianity—with the Pythagoreans or the Manichees—with the Nestorian Tartars, or Franciscan Missionaries. The most obvious moral which suggests itself to ourselves is the deceptiveness of those magnificent adjuncts which are to be found connected with such puerile superstitions, and clothing so rotten a trunk.

ART. II.—*America and the American Church.* By the Rev. HENRY CASWALL, M.A. &c. *Second Edition.* London: Mozleys. 1851.

‘OUT of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.’ This divinely-recorded maxim of human ethics may equally be applied to the language of the pen, as to its more exact signification. In literature, generally, we like to find traces of some fitness in the author for the task undertaken, or we set him down as an adventurer, who would occupy our time for his own honour and glory, or for his own profit, more than for our instruction or amusement. In an age when so many are disposed to turn authors, it behoves the public to be on their guard against impostures of this kind; nor, on the whole, do we think modern criticism to be wanting in the acuteness necessary to discriminate the presence or absence of some kind of heart from which the pen speaketh. But here, as elsewhere, the *heart* is an ambiguous term. It may either signify that kind of reality which involves the whole character, which is founded on habits, and is the result of labour, which represents an individual *life*; or it may signify the partial and inconsistent reality of mental excitement, or represent but the enthusiasm of the moment. The reading world sternly requires one of these; it likes not to swallow mere wind; but it is not always very particular in exacting the more severe interpretation which we have given to the dictation of the heart. There is, however, a great degree of satisfaction, where the subjects under notice are important, in welcoming a book as the testimony of a real practical man, who writes what he has seen and digested, and brings it to bear on questions of the day. It is a common and natural feeling, that theories are easily written, but are of little service unless facts or valuable evidence are to be obtained in support of them.

Examined on these principles, there is a singular appropriateness in Mr. Caswall’s book now placed before us; for we cannot call it a second edition of an old work, as the enlargements are so great and so important that we may examine it altogether as a book of the present day, and accept it as a valuable witness on some principal points of our Church struggles which happen just now to be under discussion. The appropriateness of this book consists, partly in the fact that its author appears at the critical moment of his own Church’s history, when she wants largeness and liberality in her practical system and her government, and gives us fourteen years’ personal experience and research in another Communion, where these same questions have been

working themselves out, with the additional test of being in another soil; and partly that it is not only a book of history or of observations, but a record of exactly that kind of inter-communion between two Churches which is likely to help on any fair mutual inquiries that may be beneficial to both sides. But what is the specific object of such mutual inquiries, and how do we hope to make them beneficial in the case of England and America at the present time? When two kindred institutions exist under different circumstances, it is always useful to compare results. By that means certain weak points in the one derive strength from the discovery that in the other case no such weakness exists, while it, in turn, imparts strength where the other needs it. For instance, the English Church has the prestige of years, and the dignity of long political power, but she wants freedom and versatility; whereas the American Church has the latter, but wants the former. In these points, therefore, they are a mutual strength to each other. This kind of comparison is beneficial, even where the respective institutions claim no particular unity of being, but are only for objects generally similar; as for example, the hospitals and asylums, or civic corporations of America, might be compared with our own with mutual advantage, in order to discover the best way of carrying out the abstract duties of charity and of self-government. Yet, however nearly the management of one approached to that of the other in consequence of such comparison, there would not be any corporate unity between them; they would be isolated institutions; the only bond of connexion being in man's conscience or his instinct. But if we suppose a common bond of external unity, a common origin, support, and government, essentially and radically shared by both, it of course follows that intercommunications, as tending to develop it, even if its existence should be doubted, will be tenfold desirable. Much of the difference of opinion on religious subjects which now agitates the world, may be traced to this source; viz. whether men look on the Christian religion in one or the other of the two suppositions we have described: whether the Christian religion is an abstract mental principle called Christianity, which, like the principle of benevolence or of self-preservation, may work itself out to the surface of society in any way it likes; or whether it is essentially connected with any absolute laws of visible existence, as the practice of loyalty in any particular country is absolutely dependent on recognising the government of that country in its visible constitution.

To those who, like ourselves, hold the theory of the Church, as a catholic and visible unity, there is no small evidence, on their side, to be derived from the present phenomena of the

American Church; and there is much that tells with great effect against the latitudinarian efforts of English politics. America, as being a new world, has been taken by the old one as a nursery-garden wherein to sow wild seed, for the chance of improved varieties of the original stock. The ground was open and free, the soil fresh, the seed most various and promiscuous, the perils and hardships, if not less, yet of a different sort; and the result must surely be a fair test of such innate qualities as, in the nature of things, are inseparable from their kind.

This is true in the religion of America perhaps more than in any other particular. Nothing can be wilder or more varied than the importations of the Christian religion which originally spread over that continent; and in the United States the non-interference of the civil power has given full room for the sorting together of these promiscuous elements, and for the development of each according to its permanent value. If, therefore, we see that the same visible constitution which Churchmen have associated with the Christian religion at home, stands the test in America, nay, flourishes more and more with the increase of social order and intellectual advancement, we may hence gather that it is an offshoot of the very same tree, that One Vine whose suckers penetrate to all lands, and of whose secret intercommunication across the wild and stormy oceans of nature and of nations we may find an outward type in the mysterious galvanic wire, as now used, to bind shore with shore. It is not too much to say, that America affords proof of the Church system being the congenial and natural helpmate of civilization; the requirements and propensities of each seem to fit in together, in proportion as the universal disorder pertaining to a new country gradually subsides. On two points especially does the history of the American Church illustrate this assertion: the one is Episcopacy, as being the ordained form of Church government, and the other is the necessity of Synodical action to the true energy of the Church. These two subjects Mr. Caswall has, we should imagine, kept always steadily in view throughout his experience, with a true conviction how aptly the testimony which he is enabled to arrange in the form of his present work may be made to bear on his Church's position at home.

Nor only let us accept the facts of the American Church as barren evidence, or as inducements to self-complacency, but let us approach this consideration with a free and reforming spirit. Let us respect her suggestions of some adaptation in ecclesiastical affairs to modern times, and be willing to engraft some popular elements, which seem consistently to arise from certain changes in society and in the Church herself, that we already

acknowledge, and to which we are irretrievably committed, even if we wished to transfer ourselves back to an earlier stage of the world's growth.

The early history of the American Church presents one long continued struggle, amid perils that carry us back to primitive ages, for certain conditions of existence without which she felt herself unable to fulfil her mission or to show what she really was. For more than a century she was refused a native Episcopate to her constant petition addressed to a British government. Must not those have been dark ages of Church feeling, when such a thing was possible? The notion of a Bishop was so entirely absorbed in the baronial dignity of our own sees, that it seemed intolerable to grant that title to mere overlookers of the Church on the other side of the Atlantic. The Erastian principle was deeply laid in our constitution after 1688, by an intense jealousy of allowing any privileges of religion to proceed from our own Church except with precisely the same civil appendages that pertained to them in England. The Protestant cry aided this result; for it first ignored all foreign bishops in the eyes of an English government, and then made our rulers fancy that the very name of Bishop, as an English word, had no other meaning than as implying a certain rank in our constitution. As American peerages, therefore, were not granted, it seemed inconsistent to grant bishoprics. All political parties seemed to arrive at the same conclusion on this subject. The Whigs were the Church's more natural foes, but the Tories practically were not much better; the former tied down the Church on principle, and the latter did so too, though on the idea that they were supporting her dignity by not making her functions too common. The absolute and essential distinctness of the Episcopal office from any appendages which an individual government may attach to it, was not seen by the Walpoles, and is but dimly seen by the Russells, though the impossibility of any valid legislation against the late papal aggression, such as could be made consistent with our general liberal policy, must have opened the eyes of many to discover the logical flaw involved in that confusion of mind which holds any more limited view of the Episcopate.

But let us trace the early course of Christ's holy religion in the new world of England's colonial empire in North America. A strangely diverse crew seem to have crossed over from Europe, bearing the name of Christians, yet the first stone of all, laid by these wanderers, was propitious:—

* On the 26th day of April, 1607, two years before the settlement of Canada by the French, seven years before the founding of New York by the Dutch, and thirteen years before the landing of the Puritans in New England, a

small band of colonists arrived on that coast, denominated, in honour of their queen, Virginia. They brought with them the prevalent habits of the higher orders of English society, and although adventurers, they had not forgotten their duty to God. Religious considerations had been combined with the motives which led to their voluntary expatriation. As members of the lately reformed Church of England, they had been required by their sovereign to provide for the preaching of the Gospel among themselves and the neighbouring Indians, and had been taught to regard their undertaking as a work which, by the providence of God, might tend "to the glory of His Divine Majesty," and "the propagating of the Christian Religion." A wise and pious clergyman, Robert Hunt by name, had accompanied them on their perilous voyage; and a humble building was soon erected as a place of worship, according to the usage of the Church of England. On the 14th of May, the day after their first landing, the colonists partook of the Lord's Supper at the hand of their pastor; and North America commenced its career of civilization with the celebration of the most holy mystery of the Catholic Church. Upon a peninsular projecting from the northern shore of James River, may still be seen the ruins of the more substantial edifice afterwards erected; and this, with its surrounding burial-ground, remains almost the sole memorial of Jamestown.' —Pp. 124, 125.

For a few years the Church of England was the only form of Christianity existing in the northern part of the continent. Sects, however, soon multiplied, and left the Church to be but one of many. In 1614 New York was colonized by the Dutch, who brought with them their own confession of faith and Presbyterian form of government. In 1620 the stream of English Puritans began to flow into Massachusetts. In 1627 the Swedes and Finns introduced Lutheranism into Delaware and New Jersey. Maryland was settled by Roman Catholics in 1634, and Pennsylvania by Quakers in 1681. Such were the various elements left to ferment together much as they liked. The Church did, indeed, enjoy some of the privileges of an establishment in the southern colonies; glebes were set apart, churches built, and a geographical demarcation of parishes was partially effected; but in the north she derived no benefit from any legal enactments, and her congregations were far from numerous. The Puritans of New England, not forgetful of their old prejudices, took special delight in persecuting the remnant of Church people, and in frustrating every effort to better their condition.

'It is to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts that the United States are chiefly indebted for the diffusion of the doctrines and faith of the Reformed Church. That Society was incorporated in 1701, and owed its existence, in a great measure, to the exertions of the zealous Dr. Bray, the Commissary of Maryland, already mentioned. By means of this valuable institution, the greater part of the clergy residing in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, were maintained, and the congregations were soon greatly increased. To this Society a liberal grant of land was made by one of the colonial authorities, which, under equitable management, might have proved eminently serviceable to the Church. When the territory of Vermont was first surveyed, the country was divided into townships, containing thirty-six square miles each, a

hundred and fourteen of which were granted by Governor Wentworth of New Hampshire. This gentleman was a member of the Church of England, and determined, on this occasion, to advance its interests. Accordingly, he reserved in each of the townships, one *right* of land, containing about 330 acres, for the first minister who might settle there, a second right as a glebe for the Church of England, and a third as an endowment for the Gospel Propagation Society. But the surveyors of the land being Puritans, or at least hostile to the Church, took care to render the grant as useless as they possibly could. Hence they sometimes managed that the portions reserved for the glebes, and those for the Society, should overlap, or entirely cover one another, while sometimes the Church beheld her property at the bottom of ponds and marshes, amid barren rocks, or on the precipitous sides of mountains. Still, among so much, there was of course a proportion of good land, and a considerable quantity not altogether worthless. This property was confiscated at the Revolution, but was finally recovered by a judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, pronounced against the State of Vermont, at the suit of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. It is now the endowment of the Church in that State, and assists, to a moderate extent, the voluntary exertions of the people.'—Pp. 129, 130.

Depressed as the Church was, and feeble in her efforts, she had still life enough to feel the true cause of her weakness. The clergy in the south became disorderly, while those in the north seemed to present but a small surface of resistance to the overwhelming torrents of dissent; but in both cases it was felt that the Church's true government was the great thing wanted. There was no Bishop to preserve discipline or to perform some of the principal offices of the Church. Nominally, the whole of British North America was under the episcopal charge of the Bishop of London; little, however, could he know of a diocese which in extent almost rivalled that claimed by the ultramontane theory of Rome, without any vicars-apostolic to perform episcopal functions. Ordination could only be obtained by crossing the Atlantic, and confirmation or consecration of churches were altogether left out of the system of the Church. With about as much meaning might the supervision of the swans on the Mississippi be given to the lord mayor of London, in addition to those on the Thames, as the continent of North America be tacked on to the diocese of London. The vastness of such an addition, as compared with the original, is simply throwing contempt on the whole duties of the office. With regard to Ordination, the effect is thus stated:—

'The few clergy in the country were all ordained in England, and of the candidates who were sent from America with this object, one-fifth perished at sea, or died by sickness resulting from exposure or change of climate. The voyage, too, was expensive as well as dangerous, and from these causes many young men who might have been ornaments to the Church became preachers in the dissenting denominations.'—P. 131.

The struggle to supply this want is a curious instance of the management of spiritual functions by the civil power:—

'Sensible of their necessities, the members of the Church of England in America had exerted themselves as early as the reign of Charles II., to obtain an Episcopate from the mother country. Their letters and memorials supplied for a whole century a connected chain of expostulations and petitions to this effect, yet still the authorities in England remained deaf to their entreaties. The accession of Queen Anne encouraged sanguine expectations of success, and the Society for Propagating the Gospel led the way in the efforts which were put forth at that period. Preparations were already made for founding at once four Bishoprics for America, when the queen's death extinguished for a time the rising hopes of the Church.'—P. 132.

The opposition which the introduction of Bishops met with in the Puritan party of America, exhibits the doctrine of partial toleration in a manner worthy of a more recent question:—

'Dr. Mayhew, a bitter Puritan in Boston, in his reply to this pamphlet, declared that the Gospel Propagation Society transcended its powers in appointing missionaries in the villages and sea-ports of New England. He represented the proposed appointment of Bishops for America as an aggressive measure, and while claiming complete liberty for Dissenters, resisted the introduction of the only means by which Churchmen could possess the full enjoyment of their religion.'—P. 133.

There were very general fears, even among the clergy themselves, that Bishops would be made political instruments in the hands of the British ministry. The revolution was now at hand, and the Church had hard work to maintain her existence, through the prejudices that raged against her during that long contest between the colony and the mother country. Churchmen were generally loyal, from the connexion which they felt to exist between themselves and the Church in England. That connexion also, on general grounds, apart from the personal loyalty of Churchmen, was one of the ties which the lovers of colonial independence would be sure to aim at severing, amongst others more directly secular. Nor could we have anticipated any other result, except on very much higher grounds of churchmanship than this country had taught her colony. If we forced them to look on the Church as necessarily depending for existence on ecclesiastical governors in England, and those, nominees of the Crown itself, of course the Church would be sure to suffer as part of the political system which was to be thrown off. An unfair and sacrilegious use of the Church had been made by the English government, to maintain a forced connexion with the mother country, having, at the same time, obviously no desire to promote her spiritual welfare and usefulness; and, as a matter of just retribution, all civil connexion was to be lost, while the two Churches remain in spiritual unity, as a witness that the only true Head of the Church is the King of kings and Lord of lords.

During the war itself the whole Church seemed to be overthrown; Trinity Church in New York was burnt down; most of

the laws in her favour were repealed, and the work of a century and a half seemed lost. When American independence was finally recognised by Great Britain, the Propagation Society withdrew its support; Church lands were confiscated; churches were in ruins, or were desecrated; numbers of the clergy fled; no centre of unity remained, and no ecclesiastical government existed. Such was the state of a Church, when exposed to the stormy world of politics, to which its true government and its local independence had been denied. Providence, however, never so far forsook her, as that the identity between the branch of the Church of England before the revolution and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States could be doubted. Amid all the ruin and confiscation, enough was left to be a sure witness to all men that these two were one and the same. The reviving efforts of the Church after the declaration of American independence are thus described, wherein we see a new element of the Church system begin to arise:—

‘The great object with Churchmen in America was now to obtain an Episcopate of their own, possessed of a true and regular succession from the Apostles. At the same time they saw the necessity of some bond of union which should prevent the adoption of varying measures, and secure the unity of the remaining clergy and congregations. The difficulties in the way of obtaining an Episcopate were very great, and their speedy removal appeared an improbable event. Hence arose the strange ecclesiastical phenomenon of Synodical Action preceding the pastoral rule of Bishops. In 1783 the Church in Maryland held its first Convention, in which it declared its right to preserve and complete itself as an entire Church, agreeably to its ancient usages and professions. It maintained its lawful right to the churches, chapels, and glebes, formerly belonging to the Church of England, and asserted the duty of the Church, when represented in a Synod of its ministers and people, to adapt its worship to the altered circumstances of America. The Church in Pennsylvania met in May, 1784, and declared its intention of maintaining the doctrines of the Gospel as held by the Church of England, and of adhering to the Liturgy as far as consistent with the Revolution. In the September of the same year the Church in Massachusetts adopted similar resolutions. But already a decided step had been taken towards the formation of a collective body, representing the entire Church in the United States. In May, 1784, Mr. White, the chaplain of Congress, and some of the ministers of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania met at Brunswick, in New Jersey, to renew a Society for the relief of the widows and orphans of clergymen. On this occasion the general state of the Church was discussed, and it was determined to procure a larger assembly, for the purpose of agreeing on some general principles of union. Such a meeting was accordingly held at New York on the 5th of the ensuing October, on which occasion eight of the different States furnished some voluntary delegates. Although the members of the assembly were not vested with powers adequate to the emergency, they happily agreed on seven leading principles of union, which they recommended to the members of the Church in the different States. These principles acknowledged Episcopacy, and the Book of Common Prayer: and provided for a representative body of the Church, consisting of Clergy and Laity, who were to vote as distinct orders. It was also

resolved that such a General Convention, composed of deputies from each State, should assemble at Philadelphia on the 27th of September in the following year. If, in the meantime, any Bishop should have been duly consecrated and settled, he was to be considered as *ex officio* a member of the Convention. The entire existing framework of the American Church has been constructed upon these primary principles.'—Pp. 137—139.

So universal was the instinct for Synodical action and for Episcopacy, when the American Church began to be free, that the Clergy of Connecticut, acting separately, had held a convention, appointed a bishop elect, and sent him off to England for consecration, before the British troops had finally evacuated New York. Dr. Seabury, the object of their choice, found impediments in the way of consecration by the Archbishop which an Act of Parliament could only remove; nor were the ministry of the day willing to introduce such an act, without an official assurance that it would not be offensive to the new government in America. He therefore went to Scotland, and was consecrated at Aberdeen, in 1784. In the following year, the first General Convention was held in Philadelphia, which, after the expression of some rather heterogeneous views, as under the circumstances would naturally be expected, finally resolved to enter into communication with the English bishops, with the view of obtaining Episcopal Succession from them. Without entering upon the particulars of those intercommunications, which chiefly concerned the alterations in the Prayer-book, about which the English bishops seem to have acted with great judgment, discretion, and courtesy, it is sufficient to our purpose to state, that, all difficulties being overcome, Dr. White and the Rev. Samuel Provoost were consecrated, in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, on the 4th of February, 1787, to the dioceses of Pennsylvania and New York. One other had been elected, but he was too poor to bear the expense of the voyage, and tendered his resignation. There was at first some hesitation in assuming local titles, from fear of offence; and Dr. White, modestly, but with considerable circumlocution, denominated himself 'Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.' The conduct of the Romish Church soon proved this caution unnecessary, and they at once adopted their proper local titles—though, unfortunately, they used territorial rather than urban designations. They did not so much erect Sees, as take the superintendence of a district. Hence a Cathedral—the Bishop's seat in his city—is yet unknown in the United States.

We have now traced the American Church from 1607 to 1787. We have seen the wretched bondage in which she was kept, for want of that government she was ever craving to possess, and we have witnessed the utter inefficiency and decay of her spiritual

position. The time which has since elapsed, though all of it can well be remembered by many now living, affords a striking contrast with the previous history. For the present condition of the American Church we will refer to Mr. Caswall's personal narrative, with his valuable dissertations on many subjects that came within his observation; but to show the progress of the Church during this later period, we extract a short account of the last General Convention:—

'The General Convention of 1850 was held in Cincinnati, and although in the interval Romanizing as well as disorganizing influences had been active, the Church appeared more than ever a compact and united body. Twenty-eight Bishops were present in the Upper House; ninety-four clergymen and seventy-one of the laity sat in the Lower. Each of these 193 persons had travelled, on an average (at his own expense), about 650 miles, to reach the place of meeting; so that, on a moderate computation, the united costs of travelling alone must have exceeded 5,000%, before the members reached their homes. This Convention assembled chiefly by the aid of steam, and its proceedings were made known day by day through the medium of the electric telegraph. It was very plain, on this occasion, that the Laity in America were an element of strength, of influence, and of safety. Beyond the ranks of the clergy, a class of well-read and practical churchmen had arisen, who were found on the side of law and order, and who understood what was due to the Episcopal and Clerical office as well as to themselves.'—Pp. 155, 156.

We said that the Episcopate of the American Church could all be comprehended in the memory of many now living, and therefore may almost be said to be the offspring of our own generation. There is, however, one individual in that Church, with whose long career of noble and useful actions this fact seems to be connected with peculiar interest. Bishop Chase, now actively engaged in the diocese of Illinois, was thirteen years of age when Bishop White was consecrated in Lambeth Chapel, and having himself been consecrated by that father of the American Episcopate, has for thirty-four years been one of its most distinguished members. This seems to make us feel, in a personal manner, that an important revival of the episcopal office is a feature of our own day, especially in free and open states, in spite of much that has been said and done on the supposition that it is a relic of the dark ages, no longer to be considered a vital part of the Christian religion. Surely this *fact*, as proved in the United States and in our present colonies, will stand against all that may now be said or written at Lambeth or elsewhere, and will calm all fears as to a sudden subversion of our own Church constitution. When a great fact of this kind may be seen steadily rolling on in one direction, as part of the spirit of our age, we can afford to contemplate, even with stoical indifference, though with personal causes of regret, more agitation than a few ordination sermons and pamphlets have yet excited

in favour of lax notions as to the presence of the Apostolic order in the rulers of our Church.

The venerable Bishop Chase is so much connected with the early part of our author's residence in America, that some particulars of his life may well be read with interest, and are given with tokens of warm affection by Mr. Caswall. He was born in 1775, was descended of English Puritans, and himself educated at Dartmouth College, a dissenting institution. He there, however, acquired a wish to join the Church, chiefly from the study of her Prayer-book, and his influence upon his whole family was so great, that ultimately they all abandoned the Independent ranks, demolished their old meeting-house, and erected a church in its stead, not a voice being raised against the measure throughout the neighbourhood. In 1795 he was ordained deacon, and officiated in various parts of America until his consecration to the diocese of Ohio in 1819. The commencement of his episcopal life is thus described :—

‘Immediately on Bishop Chase's return to Ohio, he recommenced his missionary labours with greater energy than ever. The mitre, which added *nothing* to his private means, imposed upon him new sacrifices and increased exertions. His diocesan work, as he informs us in his “Reminiscences,” involved “vast distances of journeyings on horseback, under the burning sun and pelting rain, through the mud and amid the beech-roots, over log-bridges, and through swollen streams.” As might be expected, he reached the end of his circuit of “1,279 miles on horseback, with his constitution impaired, and his voice almost gone.” New cares met him on his return home. Three parishes were to be supplied with his personal ministrations, two of which were nearly fifteen miles distant from his residence. And again and again, whenever an opening appeared for introducing a knowledge of the Church, he was ready to undertake new journeys, and to encourage, by his presence, the efforts of his scattered brethren.’—Pp. 33, 34.

In 1823 Bishop Chase visited England, to obtain assistance in founding a College in his diocese for the training of clergy; and it is from this time that our author's personal narrative commences; for though only eighteen years of age, he followed the Bishop to the far west, and became a member of Kenyon College. His first Sunday after landing in New York presents a varied picture of the religious services of that city :—

‘The next day being Sunday, the hum of business was entirely suspended throughout the great city, and an agreeable stillness universally prevailed. At eleven o'clock I went to Grace Church, a fashionable place of worship in Broadway, where I obtained my first impressions of the American Episcopal Church. The appearance of the congregation was highly respectable. The church was beautifully clean and neat, the seats were thoroughly comfortable, and the pews and aisles were handsomely carpeted. The singing and chaunting were scientifically performed, and as far as I could judge, the organ was a good one. The absence of a *clerk* surprised me at first, but I soon found that the responses of the congregation more than supplied the want of that functionary. The service was well read by Dr. Wainwright, the estimable rector, but, although substantially the same

with the English Liturgy, I was particularly struck with some minor alterations, which sounded curiously to ears habituated to the older form. The sermon was elegantly composed and forcibly delivered, and certainly was not inferior to the best discourses I had heard in England.

'In the afternoon I went to S. George's, a less fashionable place of worship, perhaps, than Grace Church, but filled with a congregation no less attentive and devout. The sermon was delivered by Mr. M'Ilvaine of Brooklyn, an eminent and popular preacher, who in process of time became my Bishop. It was designed to exhibit the distinction between the *devout* man and the *devotee*, with a view to the prevention of mere formalism in the serious business of religion. The contrast was forcibly drawn, and the two opposite characters having been conducted through the period of their probation, were finally represented as standing before the Searcher of all hearts at the Day of Judgment. A solemn application was then made to the consciences of all present, while the deepest interest was visible in the countenances of the numerous hearers.

'In the evening, from motives of curiosity, I looked into a large Methodist chapel, accompanied by my zealous fellow-passenger from Sheffield. Here I found an overwhelming congregation, the female part of which was seated on the right, and the males on the left side of the middle aisle. They were evidently of a very different class from those whom I had seen at Grace Church and S. George's; but it was left for subsequent experience to teach me how effectually the mismanagement of a century and a half, prior to the Revolution, had separated the great mass of the American population from the influence of the Church. The preacher occupied a spacious pulpit, or rather a broad platform, and was delivering himself with much emphasis and strong gesticulation. For my own part I could discover neither point nor connexion in the discourse, but the congregation listened with profound attention, and with occasional ejaculations, expressive of contrition or of praise.'—Pp. 9—11.

We cannot omit the following account of the College and episcopal residence for which our author had crossed the Atlantic. A youthful imagination, stimulated by the excitement of so long a journey, must have felt rather chilled when the object was at length reached:—

'The road from Mount Vernon to Gambier was then little more than a track, formed by felling the trees which obstructed the passage of vehicles. In some cases, where the soil was swampy, a species of road denominated *corduroy* had been formed, by laying logs close together across the track, and over these, with many a weary jolt, my conductor took his way. At length I reached the hill on which Gambier is situated, and earnestly looked upwards in the hope of beholding the streets and squares, which had made so splendid an appearance in the maps and plans published in England. On attaining the summit, I cast my eyes around, and perceived four small houses constructed of planks, two or three log-houses, and the unfinished walls of a large stone building in the distance. These were the village of Gambier and Kenyon College, and then, for the first time, I comprehended that the published plans represented a town in *design*, rather than in actual existence. I requested to be driven to the Bishop's residence, and to my consternation, I was deposited at the door of a small and rough log cabin, which could boast of but one little window, composed of four squares of the most common glass. "Is this the Bishop's Palace?" I involuntarily exclaimed. "Can this," I thought, "be the residence of the apostolic man, whose praise is in all the churches, and who is venerated by so many excellent persons in my native country?" It was even so; and, on knocking for admittance,

the door was opened by a dignified female, who soon proved to be the Bishop's lady herself. In reply to my inquiries, she informed me that the Bishop had gone to his mill for some flour, but that he would soon return. I had waited but a few minutes when I heard a powerful voice engaged in conversation outside, and immediately afterwards the Bishop entered with one of his head workmen. The good prelate, then fifty-three years of age, was of more than ordinary size, and his black cassock bore evident tokens of his recent visit to the mill. He was proceeding in his conversation with the foreman, when, on hearing my name mentioned, he turned to me and very courteously made inquiries respecting my journey and several of his friends in England. He then invited me to partake of his frugal meal, after which he desired me to accompany him to the College. On arriving at the unfinished edifice, I was amazed at the solidity of the structure. The walls were four feet thick at the foundation, but on the second story, upon which the builders were now engaged, the thickness was reduced to three feet. I ascended with my venerable guide to the highest point completed, from whence the eye wandered in every direction, as far as it could reach, over an ocean of apparently unbroken forest. While standing here, the Bishop explained several of his plans, and mentioned some of his numerous discouragements. At this moment he was almost destitute of funds, but he trusted that God would continue, as heretofore, to supply him, like Elijah in the wilderness. He often felt ready to sink under despondency; but the countenances of his noble English benefactors appeared to him in his dreams, and admonished him not to be disheartened. From the College we descended to a piece of ground but partially cleared of trees. "This," said the Bishop, "is Sutton Square, so named from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury." A little further on he informed me that I was in Bexley Square, and still further to the right was a thick portion of forest which he declared was Burgess Street, called after the name of the venerable Bishop of Salisbury. In another part of the surrounding woods he showed me the unoccupied site of a Church, to be denominated Rosse Chapel, from the Countess Dowager of Rosse. A large cucumber-tree occupied the place of the future altar, a spreading sumach stood in the place marked for the font, and a stately sycamore supplied the absence of the steeple.—Pp. 23—25.

About 10,000 persons are said to have been the number in Ohio who recognised Bishop Chase as their ecclesiastical head, and these were scattered amongst a population of every phase of religion or irreligion. The students numbered about 50 or 60, but rose to 170, from various classes of life, among whom were three or four Indians, whom the habits of the place, however, did not suit, for they soon absconded. The Bishop did not take a very prominent part in the instruction, this being done by Professors: his own occupation, and also the beginning of many troubles, is told us as follows:—

'It is possible to conceive the existence of a community, like that at Kenyon College, living in the midst of the woods in the simplicity of primitive Christianity, gladly submitting to the paternal sway of their Bishop, from a principle of obedience to lawful authority, controlling alike the teachers and the taught. But though an interesting place, Gambier was not a perfect Utopia. The Bishop was sometimes engaged at a distance visiting his diocese, or, more frequently, in collecting funds in the Eastern States. Generally, when at home, he was engrossed in his building operations, and in the care of the College estate. He rose at three o'clock every morning, wrote his letters, and spent his time till night in superintending

the masons, carpenters, and ploughmen. The Professors (or Faculty, as they were termed) formed a body by themselves, and though generally clergymen, they were republicans, and were averse to be controlled by the mere will of the Bishop in his episcopal capacity. The students, too, had, of course, imbibed republicanism with their earliest ideas, and were by no means inclined to submit to the bare exercise of power in any shape. Yet they were not a disorderly body. They were largely endowed with that capacity for self-government which is so prominent a feature in the American character. And it was through this channel that the influence of the Bishop, or of the Professors, was usually brought to bear upon them. Thus, for example, it was desired that an extensive garden should be formed, partly for ornament, but principally to supply the common table with vegetables. Accordingly, a few of the more influential students were called together, and the advantage of forming a "Horticultural Society" was represented to them.—Pp. 39, 40.

Our author's life at Gambier was generally a studious one, but his vacations were varied by expeditions or even long journeys. During his first winter he undertook the distribution of Bibles. As might be expected in such an incipient state of society as surrounded him, he met with adventures in this work :—

'I rode forward, and about dark came to a farmhouse, where I was well received by the proprietor, one Joseph Denman, who told me that he had fought with the British at the Revolution, and also in the late war. Hearing that a singing-school was to assemble in a neighbouring log-house, I went there with Denman's son, and remained a long time, while about sixty persons, chiefly Baptists, were taking their lessons. After all was over, I explained to them my object in visiting their township, which they approved of, but said that their school district had already been supplied with Bibles by the Baptists and Methodists. In this respect I afterwards found their information not altogether correct. I returned and slept at Denman's.

'In the morning, the old man desired me to show him a copy of the Constitution of our Bible Society. When he saw that the Bishop was *ex-officio* its president, he grew quite furious, and swore that the Bishop wanted to make himself a king, or at least to introduce English power into Knox County. He stated his firm conviction that the College was designed for an English fort, and that the massive nature of its walls could be accounted for only on this supposition. He asserted that the Bishop's object in going to England was, that he might make his own arrangements with the despotic government of that country. He declared that it was impossible that the English should have sent such vast sums to assist the Bishop without a sinister motive, and concluded by charging me with being a spy in the service of the British government, as well as an emissary hired by the Bishop, to make proselytes to his new religion. I bore this storm with as much composure as possible, and when it ceased, I asked the old man to let me know how much I owed him for my lodging, supper, and breakfast, all of which had been very comfortable. He declined taking any compensation; so I thanked him for his hospitality, and departed.'—Pp. 46, 47.

Other good offices were undertaken nearer to the College, of which the following is an example :—

'After a slight breakfast on Sunday mornings, we left the College at seven o'clock, crossed Vernon River in a boat, which I had constructed for

the purpose, and, by the aid of my pocket-compass, proceeded through the woods about six or seven miles towards the south-west. The tall straight trees around us consisted of oak, hickory, sugar-maple, sycamore, walnut, poplar, and chestnut, and the wild vine often hung over our heads in graceful festoons. Occasionally we heard the notes of singing-birds; but far less frequently than in England. Deep silence generally prevailed, and prepared the mind for serious reflection. Here and there we passed a recent clearing, on which the gigantic trees were still standing, but deadened by the operation of *girdling*. Now and then we climbed over a rude fence constructed of rails split by the axe, and piled up in a zigzag form, without any nails or other fastenings. Sometimes we called at log-houses to lend religious books, or to receive them when read. Sometimes we found people ready to assist us by lending a horse to facilitate our locomotion. At the end of our journey we arrived at a small village, or rather a collection of log huts, the scene of our labours. We entered the school-house, a rough log building, with a huge chimney at one end, and a fire-place extending across one side of the apartment. Soon the children came flocking from the cabins and through the woods, accompanied by their parents and many other grown people. In a short time the room was filled, and a number of persons were often obliged to stand outside for want of accommodation. As the people were full of sectarian prejudices, though few of them were actually members of any denomination of religionists, we were obliged to proceed with great caution. One of us, for example, gave out a hymn from the American Prayer-Book, reading two lines at a time, which the whole assembly joined in singing. All then knelt down to prayer, when a large portion of the Church Service was repeated from *memory*, since "praying by a book" would in the first instance appear a kind of abomination. After prayer, a lesson from the Old Testament was read and explained as clearly and familiarly as was possible to us. The elder part of the assembly then dispersed for an hour or two, while the children were instructed in reading the Scriptures. All came together again afterwards, when a lesson from the New Testament was read and explained, and a few words of exhortation were added, concluding with some Collects recited by memory, and a parting hymn. We always found the people hospitable and anxious to entertain us as well as possible. Their prejudices generally died away very rapidly, before long the Prayer-Book was introduced without offence, and a decided improvement in religion and morals was perceptible. Such services as the above were of course far from strictly regular, in a canonical sense; but the Bishop encouraged them on account of what he deemed the urgency of the case, and because in several neighbourhoods they constituted the sole means (in any shape) of public worship and religious instruction.—P. 58—60.

Once a year the Annual Convention of the diocese assembled at Gambier, when about twenty clergy and thirty or forty lay delegates attended. All were guests of the Bishop, and dined at the common table, with the students, on most simple fare. Opposite principles, however, were at work in these gatherings, and we have disclosed to us, in the painful history of Bishop Chase's resignation of the Ohio diocese, some of the evils and dangers which have to be encountered in Synodical action, as in every other active and living element in the business of this world. The Professors of the College were inclined to very low views of the Church, while the Bishop rested his prerogative on the Apostolical succession, and was moreover blamed for

taking to himself too arbitrary a control of secular matters connected with the College, as well as ecclesiastical in the diocese. Wherever there is life we are sure to meet with many characteristic peculiarities, and therefore we must not be too severe on some intolerance of actively employed power among American Professors and Clergy. The habits and feelings of a new republic made them sensitively jealous of individual freedom and impatient of control. We should be sorry, however, to trouble our readers with the details of this dispute. The Bishop resigned, and his resignation was accepted by the Convention. This seemed a dangerous precedent, and much to the injury of episcopal power; it was therefore some time before the General Convention would sanction the proceeding, and more stringent rules with regard to the resignation of a Bishop have accordingly been enacted.

It was with a bitter pang that he left Gambier, and retired to a farm belonging to his niece at no great distance. This new residence, as if to add to his feeling of desolation, was miserably out of repair, so much so, that he had to procure the assistance of some neighbours, before he could patch up the log-house to be proof against the weather.

'But such a situation could only be regarded as a temporary retreat. In the year 1832 the Bishop purchased an extensive estate in a beautiful prairie country near the river St. Joseph, in Michigan, 300 miles to the westward. Though the war with the Indian Black Hawk was raging in the neighbourhood, Bishop Chase at once commenced the work of cultivating the soil. A stout ploughman went before, turning up the furrows of rich earth, while the Bishop followed with a bag of maize, three or four seeds of which he deposited "every two feet in every third furrow." In this labour, together with that of planting potatoes, he spent most of the day for several weeks, while on Sundays he sought a field of spiritual toil in the settlements ten or twelve miles distant. Having commenced the erection of a dwelling with five rooms, he returned to Ohio, and conveyed his family from the "Valley of Peace" to their new abode, denominated by the Bishop, GILEAD.'—P. 320, 321.

In a few years the Bishop grew rich, as our author remarks, after the manner of Job, but he was not long destined to be without a spiritual charge. In 1835 he was invited to assume episcopal jurisdiction in Illinois, which he accepted. Nothing discouraged by the poor return of gratitude which he had received for his efforts in founding Kenyon College, so impressed was he with the necessity of such an institution, in connexion with the Bishop of a diocese, that he forthwith undertook to establish one in Illinois, which now is in work under the name of Jubilee College. In the General Convention of 1850, he was the presiding Bishop of the American Church, and though much exhausted by age and infirmity, he still remains a bright example of apostolic life, as of the apostolic office.

In 1831, Mr. Caswall was admitted into deacons' orders, and undertook the charge of a congregation at Portsmouth, on the Ohio. His going to this place is made the occasion of introducing a most interesting account of a lay member of the Church, by whose long-continued exertions that congregation has been founded and maintained. Mr. Gunn is said to be a fair specimen of many laymen in America, as zealous and indefatigable in the cause of their Church. We will not spoil the interest of this history, by extracting only part, and the whole is too long; we therefore pass it over, and will confine ourselves more immediately to our author's personal observations. An insight into his proceedings at Portsmouth we may give in the following passage:—

'From this period Portsmouth began to improve rapidly. On the 30th of December we made our final arrangements for building our Church; we decided upon our plan, appointed a building committee, and engaged the workmen. About the same date our new Bishop, Dr. M'Ilvaine, visited Portsmouth for the first time. He preached a very eloquent sermon on the evening of his arrival, and a large congregation was collected at an hour's notice, notwithstanding the deep mud in the streets, and the dreadful state of the weather. The next morning, at nine o'clock, there was another service, and, after a second eloquent sermon, I had the pleasure of presenting to the Bishop five grown persons for Confirmation. One of these had been a Romanist, one a Baptist, one a Methodist, and the other two had been educated in the Church. The Lord's Supper was administered by the Bishop to a large number of communicants, all of whom seemed deeply affected on this interesting occasion.

'Not long afterwards we laid the first stone of our little church. The dimensions were to be forty-seven feet by thirty-four, and the material was to be chiefly brick. It was also determined that the seats should be *open* and free to all. This building was consecrated in the course of 1833; and the good Mr. Gunn's wishes were thus accomplished within a year after his death. The congregation soon filled it; they added a gallery and an organ, and in the course of a very few years a parsonage house was built by them, and annexed to the Church. One end of the sacred edifice was then removed, and a great addition made to it in length. A further enlargement afterwards increased its breadth, and, within the last few years, the parishioners have removed it entirely, and erected in its place a capacious church in an ecclesiastical style of architecture, capable of accommodating 600 or 800 persons.'—Pp. 163, 164.

From ill health Mr. Caswall was compelled to leave Portsmouth, and after a journey of 1,290 miles, he settled at Andover College, in New England, sixteen miles from the sea, where he was principally engaged in study, having the use of an extensive library in that institution. The position of the place is thus described:—

'Andover is one of those pretty villages, for which the states of New England are distinguished. From the Seminary, which occupies a very lofty position, there is an extensive prospect of a cultivated country, with blue mountains in the north and west, from fifty to eighty miles distant.

At one point in the neighbourhood I was able to count the towers of more than twenty of the old Puritan meeting-houses, which in the distance reminded me of the village churches of England.'—P. 175.

The friends and supporters of the Church in America are not confined to clergy and laymen, examples of whose zeal we have already witnessed, but laywomen there, as elsewhere, are to be found in her foremost ranks :—

'Leaving Salem, I proceeded four miles to Marblehead, another venerable town, standing on a rocky promontory projecting into the Atlantic Ocean. Here I found an Episcopal Church, built in the form of a cross, and about a hundred and twenty years old. The congregation had been reduced very low, most of its *male* members having deserted it or died. Under these discouraging circumstances the ladies remained steadfast, and these unflinching daughters of the Church had for some time supplied the offices of *wardens* and *vestry* from among themselves. Their perseverance was rewarded by final success, and at the time of my visit they had relinquished their official position in favour of the other sex. In the course of three years, under the care of an energetic Rector, this parish numbered seventy-four communicants, and a hundred and twenty-one Sunday scholars.'—P. 181.

The subsequent experience of our author was chiefly connected with places of education, the pastoral office not, however, being neglected. In 1834 he was appointed professor of sacred literature at a college near Lexington in Kentucky; in 1838 he removed to Canada, near the Falls of Niagara; and in 1841 he was appointed theological professor in Kemper, near S. Louis, in the Missouri. It is more to our purpose, however, to examine his observations, as they bear on general questions, than to give the details of his transatlantic residence, though we cannot but call attention, by way of a little variety, to his experience of some warlike proceedings during his residence on the borders of Canada. A band of American sympathisers had taken possession of a mill on the Canadian side of the water, anticipating a large reinforcement from the rebels. The conclusion of this proceeding is thus described :—

'About three in the afternoon the militia marched out and surrounded the redoubtable mill, in order to prevent the escape of its inmates by land. The great guns also, drawn by six horses each, rolled out of the town an hour afterwards, and the regulars who accompanied them took their position on a rising ground within half a mile of the tower. Three steamers and two gun-boats were stationed on the opposite side of the enemy, who were thus completely hemmed in by an overwhelming force both by land and by water. The vessels on the river first commenced their ineffectual fire, and, as they dropped down the stream to avoid the shots of the 18-pounders, some of their little balls ploughed up the ground within a few yards of the spot where I was engaged in conversation with the rector of Prescott. But when the 18-pounders were brought to bear on the tower, it soon appeared that they were discharged to some purpose; and the stone walls, strong as they were, began to exhibit indications of an approaching collapse. Such of the balls as missed their aim, struck the surface of the river, and danced over the water for about a mile, to the American shore,

where they created great alarm among the multitudes who had assembled as spectators. The brigands fired very few shots in return, and were soon dislodged from their strong position. The troops now advanced rapidly, and opened a smart fire of musketry upon the enemy, which was promptly returned. At length they succeeded in setting fire to all the buildings around the mill, and as it was now dark the flames showed the position of the combatants, and produced an awfully sublime effect. The enemy had now been driven again within the tower, when, finding their condition desperate, many of them surrendered at discretion. Some had been burnt to death in the buildings; others were found up to their chins in the water; and Von Schultz himself was discovered in a thicket while endeavouring to escape. The prisoners were chiefly American citizens, and nearly every one of them had been provided with a rifle, a brace of pistols, a bowie knife, and an abundance of ammunition. A large supply of arms, 150 kegs of powder, three cannon, and a quantity of provisions, were also captured.—Pp. 240—242.

It is difficult to compare the educational system of the American Church with our own. The circumstances which surround our universities and public schools give them a prominence, as national establishments, which it would be contrary to the genius of the American people to establish among themselves. With us, moreover, they are the inheritance of a former age, and derive their dignity and importance from the theory of a much more extended churchmanship than at present prevails.

It is the exclusive privilege of a people united in religion to found educational institutions that sink deep into the national character; whereas, schism and disunion naturally prevent any efforts after largeness and nobility of design from having more than very partial results. We could not refound Oxford or Eton, for we possess in them some of the peculiar advantages which arise from a position of the Church that has long passed away. The present generation has tried to establish great colleges, and is aiming at grand schemes of education, for which we may fairly wish success, though convinced that in the present divided state of religion, it must after all be an irregular scrambling work, individuals and parties doing the best they can for themselves under a variety of conflicting circumstances. We are far from saying that we ought, perforce, to go back again to a time when toleration-acts were unknown, and every good subject was supposed also to be a churchman. We must rather take facts as they are, and aim at consistency in what plainly is the spirit of the day. If the Church has lost one kind of advantage, viz.—that of a universal acknowledgment of her spiritual character as a component part of our national constitution; let her be careful not to be hampered with its difficulties; but rather enjoy another kind of privilege, viz.—that freedom and toleration of self-government which are supposed to be the features of the present time.

We only, however, introduce this reflection to prevent any

disappointment in reviewing the educational plans of the American Church. We must not take credit to ourselves, as if we had established those at home, of which we are so justly proud. Religion altogether in America is so dissolved into its chymical elements, that cooperation, or any extensive union, for purposes of education, otherwise than entirely without any notice of religion, is quite impossible. In some States public money is voted in this way for secular education, but if we may believe our author, without any very great success.

'The common schools throughout the United States are designed to convey instruction at least in reading, writing, grammar, geography, and arithmetic. The Bible or the New Testament is, in many cases, used as a school-book; but, as a general rule, any definite system of religious teaching would be regarded as *sectarian*, and would not be tolerated. Yet, even under this disadvantage, conscientious teachers sometimes succeed in forming (with Divine help) devotional and moral habits in the minds of their youthful charge. The principles of republican society are not favourable to reverent and implicit obedience on the part of pupils, and "moral suasion" is deemed the "more excellent way." It is stated in a late American paper that the proportion of those who cannot read and write has greatly increased during the last ten years, and the same authority asserts that, in one of the Western States, out of a population of a million, there are 175,017 persons, over 21 years of age, in that unhappy predicament.—Pp. 199, 200.

It necessarily follows, from this state of things, that church-schools and colleges are, strictly speaking, in a sectarian position, deriving no numerical strength from the wide and inclusive character of an established Church. Yet, if we take into account these circumstances, the comparatively small sect which the Church as yet is, and the very recent period from which we may date her free and active life, it is most encouraging to find that so many colleges and schools are busy in carrying on the work of education in an ecclesiastical spirit. It is a sign that the Church is being founded on true and permanent principles; and if the number of students is not yet large in some of them, the machinery is being perfected, the roots are gaining hold of the soil, and the plants will doubtless grow up with health and vigour. There are, in the United States, 121 colleges, 42 of which are theological seminaries, 8 of them under the control of the Church, with others more or less under its influence. Besides these, there are many schools, often in connexion with colleges, both together being under the superintendence of the Bishop, as in New Jersey, where the zealous and indefatigable Bishop Doane has illustrated the strength which such an arrangement can afford to the Church, in a manner that claims the true gratitude of all churchmen. We cannot better describe Burlington College and S. Mary's Hall, as these two institutions are called, than by laying before our readers a paper, or a

letter, addressed to the *Churchman Newspaper*, with reference to the design of the former, and a short extract from a farewell address from the Bishop to the scholars of the latter, at the end of a half-year's labour.

'What was the Bishop's wish? What his proposed design? To found an institution for the Church and of the Church. This was a bold effort; its Trustees must needs be members of the "Protestant Episcopal Church." True to the Church, and to the truth as it is witnessed by the Church, there could be no catering for favours out of the Church. "BURLINGTON COLLEGE IS A CHURCH INSTITUTION," was inscribed upon its banner. "Holy Scripture will be daily read. Holy prayer will be daily offered." It was "the conception of one, who felt himself to be a debtor to the Cross, for infinitely more than all that he can do, or be." Let the Bishop speak for himself:

"As that without which all the rest were vain, it is our design, at Burlington College, to bring up Christians. The word of God is daily read, at morning and evening. At morning, at noon, and at evening, we kneel in daily prayers. The precept of the Wise Man is continually obeyed, 'Catechise a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it.' The means of grace are constantly employed. The hope of glory is steadfastly proposed. The pastoral feet are constantly in motion in our sacred fold. The pastoral eye is constantly alert, to watch and guard our lambs. We have set the Cross before us, as the magnet of our souls. We bend before the Holy One, who died upon it, to beseech Him that He will draw us by it to Himself." These were not mere words of promise; held out, to ask for favour, and suffered to pass away, in sound. They have been verified in a careful and patient observation of the Church's order for daily services; and in the Church's counsel for the maintenance of her holy discipline.'

At S. Mary's Hall, the Bishop thus affectionately speaks to his scholars:—

'Farewell. Go in the good path, faithfully. Duty is unity. It seeks one end. It seeks it in one way. The end, the way, God's will. As one, as He is. Hence, the necessity of firmness, in adhering to the good choice made at first. And in this, dear children, lies your greatest difficulty. It has been your happiness, that you were helped in the good choice. You were born of Christian parents. In holy baptism, they early made you Christians. They took you to the Church of Christ while your feet tottered yet, and your tongues lisped. They had you taught your duty, in the blessed Catechism. They kept you at the feet of Christian Pastors, as the lambs of Christ. They brought you to this Christian fold. For months and years they kept you in its gracious shelter, and beneath its sacred shadow. If your hearts have not resisted heavenly grace, and rejected holy opportunities, and hardened themselves against all good influences, you are in the good path. Your eyes have learned to know it. Your feet have learned to walk in it. Your hearts have learned to love it. Is it so? Dear children of my love, lambs of my Saviour's flock, baptized and bathed in His most precious blood, is it, is it so? The trial, if it is, is to begin to-day. From this day, new temptations will beset you. From this day, new hindrances will befall you. From this day, new dangers will surround you. Can you hold fast "the beginning of your confidence?" Can you say to Satan, "Get behind me?" Can you say to the world, I am crucified to you with Christ? Can you say to the flesh, Be subdued and subjected to the Spirit? "To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." To go in the good path; to go on in it faithfully and constantly unto the

end; this, my beloved children, is your duty and your difficulty: and this is what I mean, when I say to you, Farewell.'

The plan of study in an American college, is generally very ambitious; more so than can seem practicable to ourselves; which is explained by Mr. Caswall as follows:—

'The English reader will be inclined to marvel at the considerable amount of nominal study required in order to fit a young American for holy orders. But, until very recently, a habit of *thoroughness* has not been deemed essential to scholarship. The mind has been cultivated very much as the ground is tilled by the settler in the back-woods. In the fields of Indiana, or Arkansas, the traveller will, of course, miss the smooth pastures, the trim hedges, and the level corn-fields of English agriculture. He will see the plough winding its way among enormous stumps, and sometimes barely scraping the ground, on account of the roots which still remain below the surface. Here and there he will find that the settler has not even taken the trouble to fell the trees, but has been satisfied for the present with killing them, by cutting through the bark. And round the whole estate, perhaps, there runs a rude fence, constructed partly of rails, and partly of fallen trees. Yet, amidst all this rough and superficial work, a crop will ripen on the productive soil more abundant than the spectator would have considered possible. This is a fair type of American Collegiate Education in general, as compared with that of the Universities of Europe, although of course there are exceptions. It has been considered, that a moderate acquaintance with a variety of subjects has answered a better practical end, in the circumstances of the country, than habits of profound thought and patient investigation. But a demand for a higher order of education has commenced, which will unquestionably lead to a more scientific system of mental culture, and, before many years, we may hope than an English scholar will have no further occasion to smile at the peculiar concords, or the grotesque prosody of the western student.'

—Pp. 203, 204.

The General Theological Seminary at New York is for the purpose of study after the ordinary collegiate course is expired, and a large proportion of the whole body of clergy have been members of it. Its influence has invariably been of a high-church character, and therefore it is not universally popular. The unhappy affair also of Bishop Onderdonk has been the occasion of a considerable falling off in its members of late years. We must now, however, pass over from the subject of education to other topics.

There is no part of the American Church system which must, at the present time, engage the attention of ourselves with the same interest as its Synodical action. If we have given episcopacy to a sister church, we shall receive good interest for our gift if we, in return, gain from her some help towards re-establishing among ourselves that necessary element of church government, signified by the term Synod, with its various derivatives. It will be an overwhelming testimony to the reality of these two elements of church government, if the same generation of men may see England and America first giving practical acknowledgment that episcopacy is a Catholic element

of the Church, tied by no national accidents or customs; and then showing the fruits of that mutual sympathy, by the one, who received the first gift, making such good use of it, as to bring into active power, and clearly to mark with the Catholic stamp, the dormant principle of Convocation, and thus to afford an irresistible argument in aid of those who are struggling in England for the same privilege.

The republican theory of government, as worked out in the United States, has at least had this advantage, that it has shed a certain very useful gleam of light on the Church, which the old Tory notions of Church and King very much obscured. We yield to none in loyalty, nor do we forget that kings have been the Church's nursing-fathers and queens her nursing-mothers, when, humanly speaking, she had but little other help; as Churchmen we bear immortal gratitude to a chivalrous age of kings, who in their day moulded the standard of the world's nobility so far after the Church's laws, as to have left behind them, even to this day, a faint tradition which cannot well be shaken off, even by those who would,—that the highest gifts of humanity, the most excellent parts of our race, the gentlest feelings of mutual intercourse, the truest courtesy of general bearing, the noblest courage of mind, the grandest efforts of Christian charity, and the most steady development of intellectual culture, are all, in some mysterious way, connected with the Church; yet for all this we cannot but feel that a certain use has been made of loyalty, by its public administrators for some generations, which is oppressive and injurious to the Church. So far also as this has been too unfair a test, imposed on the loyalty of those who really begin to feel what the Church is, we hold that, according to the natural retribution of the order of things, a republican theory has it in its power to show forth a certain phase of truth which that system of Church and King has kept out of sight. This is far from saying that we would choose the republican system for the Church's welfare in preference to our constitutional theory; we are only drawing a particular conclusion from a particular view of the question, and not striking a general balance, such as is supposed to be the ground of an abstract choice. Moreover, it is not our place to select forms of government; we only take them as facts, and then compare their details. We shall presently show that the republican theory presents great obstacles to the Church's more perfect working, and in fact, that her system naturally tends to the paternal exercise of royal functions; but, nevertheless, if we feel the constitutional liberty of the Church to be under a disadvantage in our own case, we have a perfect right to agitate for the engrafting into our Church's practical working,

so much of her developed position under a republican government, as we have good grounds for thinking is her right, and is for her ultimate advantage in the free exercise of her spiritual office. America seems to supply that experience which is needful to back up our home claims, and prevent them assuming too visionary and unreal a character; and therefore it is that we look with such peculiar interest to a book like Mr. Caswall's, containing his careful experience and watchful powers of observation throughout a number of years, in the great variety of positions which he occupied within that Church, such as were capable of showing to him her daily work from one end to the other of her constitution.

Nor can it be brought as a charge against this picture of the Church's constitution in America, that it is made too perfect, is too one-sided, or savours too much of that kind of testimony which betrays the party advocate. We have real life given to ecclesiastical self-government in the United States, by its abuses, its unpleasant features, its tendency to encourage self-conceit and pomposity in ill-regulated minds, and occasionally by its acts of cruelty, as well as in its obvious power to build up the Church, as a working vigorous institution, on a solid foundation. Some of the evils, however, are plainly attributable to the unwillingness of a portion of the Church to accept in its true character those episcopal functions for the exercise of which, as a body, she so long and urgently petitioned; and others are simply those manifestations of the defects in the national character which active work of any kind is sure to bring out to the surface.

For any complete idea of the constitution and standing of the American Church, with a view to understanding the functions and powers of its synodal action, we must refer to our author's own account, mere extracts from which would be to little purpose. A brief summary, however, sufficient to explain the main difference of position between a Church that is established, and one that rests entirely on her own internal management, may perhaps be given in very few words.

In the first place, what we call a parish, which has definite legal boundaries, does not exist, with the exception of some remnants of an original division of that kind in the south. For this, therefore, we must in our minds substitute the idea of a congregation, beyond the limits of which the clergyman has no more pastoral charge than in a missionary character. By this, however, we are not to understand a fluctuating number of individuals, who form part of this congregation or not, by the simple fact of being inside or outside certain doors. A parish in America,—for the name is still preserved, as if by a traditional right on the Church's part to have territorial demarca-

tions, even if they cannot literally be effected,—consists of a congregation of people, who associate together for common religious objects, and accept the rules fixed upon by Diocesan authority, their mutual relations within themselves being generally secured, on all points involving property or secular rights, by an act of incorporation, easily obtained from the legislature, whereby the parish becomes in the eye of the law a corporate body, in the same manner as a railway company. The body thus constituted meet together and are accepted by the Diocesan authorities as forming part of the Church, on its undertaking to conform with its rules in doctrine and discipline, and to carry out its appointed method of regulating their internal affairs. A name is agreed to, similar to the designations of our own parishes, and a vestry appointed, consisting of about twelve members with two wardens. The powers of the wardens and vestry include the appointment of the so-called rector, and it fixes his salary, derived from pew-rents or voluntary offerings, as the case may be; there being also a process of induction by which, when performed, it is understood that the connexion is not to be severed unless for weighty reasons. The rector presides at vestry meetings; and the respective duties of himself, of the wardens, and vestrymen, are sufficiently obvious to allow us to pass on to the next stage, viz. the diocesan authority. This consists, in the first place, of a Bishop, who acts as president, and then of the clergy canonically resident in the diocese, with lay deputies from each parish or congregation. Once a year these meet together and form the Diocesan Convention. There is some variety in the constitution of their power, dependent often on whether the popular element or the episcopal had priority of position on the ground. Generally, however, their power may be stated as wholly legislative, and confined to matters which affect that diocese alone, and not others in common with itself. It is altogether subject, on larger questions, to the General Convention. On the vacancy of the bishopric, it nominates, but the general convention must ratify the appointment. The clergy and laity commonly vote together, but may do so separately if demanded.

The General Convention meets once in three years, and has supreme power in all matters that affect the whole Church in union with it. The Upper House consists of bishops, and the Lower of clerical and lay representatives, four of each being sent by each diocese. This house, therefore, at present numbers 256, the two elements, lay and cleric, often voting separately, as in the Diocesan Convention. The powers of the General Convention are described by our author at some length, after which he sums up in the following words:—

'The English reader will perhaps find it difficult to dissociate this statement of *powers*, and the definition of powers, from some ideas of an authority proceeding, in the first instance at least, from the State, and enabling the Convention to act in the mode described above. But history will show that no such authority has been either desired or accepted in the American Church. The essential authority of the Church, as existing in the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity, has been found, in practice, abundantly adequate to the direction and limitation of its own energies. Civil legislation would add but little, if anything, to the weight of the American Canons, whether General or Diocesan. At all events, the members of the Church in the United States are convinced that legislative interference on the part of their several governments would be an incalculable injury, and that the civil authority needs the protection of religion far more than religion requires the assistance of the State.

'The Canons have not been framed according to any preconceived ideal of a perfect system, but have been enacted, repealed, modified, or enlarged, as circumstances have required. Hence they are comprised within a small space; they are simple, practical, easily understood, and intended to be observed. There may still be many defects in them; but the harassing question can never occur as to which of them are binding, or which *obsolete*. And it is found that a general conformity to these Canons is secured by the force of public opinion and ecclesiastical feeling in the members of the Church, both lay and clerical.'—Pp. 114, 115.

Here, then, we have a system of church government created by the actual needs of churchmen, without any peculiar predilection for ecclesiastical theories of mediæval date. On the contrary, it is opposed to them in some of its details, and, therefore, may be fairly claimed as the natural and spontaneous growth of the Church in America, left free to her own devices, and dependent on her own resources. Now, if we perceive that this natural form of church government corresponds with the theory of our Church, and of the whole Church Catholic, we have a right, in the first place, to claim that theory as not wholly out of date, not a mediæval folly, not impracticable in an enlightened age, not inconsistent with the 19th century. But how does the system we have been calling attention to correspond with the theory of our own Church? The General Convention is the exact antitype of the two houses of Convocation, with but one exception, that we shall presently notice. The Bishop of Exeter has proved our Church, also, to have the power of assembling in Diocesan Synod, and the parochial system corresponds very nearly with our own. For certain religious functions, therefore, we find American churchmen adopting a plan, which people in England have long possessed in theory, but which they suppose to be now defunct in many of its parts. But it may be said that such a plan in a non-established church is obvious, and plain enough, but that there is all the difference among ourselves. Now the amalgamation of two powers must always be on equable terms, and must not deprive either of what, in the nature of things, is in its own

peculiar province. The one may have power within the other, by mutual agreement, or rather by a kind of solution, the one into the other, but each one must still do the description of work peculiar to itself. The union of Church and State is of this kind. If primarily a certain kind of government is essential to the Church's well-being, and is a part of her very nature, a union with the State on such terms as would deprive her of it is unfair. The example of America, according as it does, in main points, with the whole Catholic theory, is convincing proof that such is the government of the Church, and, therefore, that nothing else can properly be so; and, therefore, as a final conclusion, that if practically we find our own Church not so governed, we have a right to claim a re-adjustment of power. Nor is it a slight consideration in our own favour, that the Church has never formally sanctioned any terms of agreement with the State that deprive her of Convocation as her chief power in spiritual things. She has indeed acknowledged the State as supreme, not only in temporal matters generally, but also in her own, thereby differing from the freedom of the American Church, as she does from a private corporation among ourselves; but, as the natural balance against this, in the division of work, the Church exercises spiritual power, not only over herself, or rather not only over her members in their individual capacity, but over the State as such, for the crown itself is conferred by the Church, and on certain ecclesiastical conditions.

The difference, therefore, between the position of a church established and non-established is not in essentials of her government, as we have reason to conclude Convocation to be, but only in a differently adjusted balance of labour and privileges. There is, however, one difference between what we have endeavoured to show is the natural and essential government of a free church in the present day, and the theory of our own, which may at first seem an objection to our whole argument. This is, the important lay voice in all synods, which has been already referred to. But the Church never did dispense really with the influence of her lay members; for although Convocation among ourselves is altogether clerical, it is because the civil parliament is, or was supposed to be Christian, and was acknowledged as having a general, though external power over all the proceedings of the clergy. The lay element, therefore, in our legal constitution, was only transferred from Convocation to an acknowledged external influence, and not annulled. Or even if we go further back to feudal time, before the exact adjustment of rights on either side, which our constitution in theory possesses, we shall find that, without any very willing reception may be of lay influence, yet the violent self-will of the barons was so far

X

acknowledged as a fact, that it entered into all Church counsels ; and it was only from the necessity of assuming a defensive attitude, that the Church, in common with every institution, and almost every individual of the times spoken of, apparently made her counsels exclusive. Even social intercourse was carried on with arms all ready to check encroaching violence ; and men lived in defended castles, though not liable to the charge of being unnaturally misanthropic or exclusive. In the still earlier ages of the Church, it is unnecessary that we should here prove, how willing the authority of kings and emperors was respected as the lay voice in ecclesiastical arrangement. The only difference, therefore, between the synodical action of early time, and as now developed in America and in other churches, is in the quarter whence lay influence is received, whether, according to the regal or imperial notion, from a king or emperor, as guiding paternally or commanding the voice of the people ; or whether, according to the republican theory, from the actual presence of individual laymen, representing others and having a voice in the government of their own order. The difference is, whether lay influence is received from above or below. In whatever way the secular government is managed, we may be sure that according to the same principle will the voice of laymen be heard in Church counsels. If that government be one of violence, it will be by violence that the Church is made to hear ; if it be one of well-ordered royalty, the king will be the Church's father ; if it be one of popular representation, by the same principle will the laity of the Church possess their share of power. In all cases the Church's own essential rule remains the same, so long as she takes care that the distinctly clerical office be not overpowered by the voice of the laity, from whatever quarter it comes ; and also the fact remains the same that, if the Church cares about her work and feels what she is, there are actual synods and convocations held, that men do really meet together to consult on Church questions, be they lay or clerics, and that an external power is not accepted as the supreme authority in her spiritual office.

It would be beyond our present object to make these remarks bear in any general way upon the attempted revival of our own Convocation, but we must point out one or two considerations with reference to it, even if we would understand the nature of the lesson we might derive from our American sister. We have only dealt with the non-establishment of the American Church as a fact, and drawn certain conclusions from a state of things which actually exist beyond our control. The premises, however, being different in this country, the conclusion we must also expect to be different. A certain degree of caution, there-

fore, is most necessary in taking for granted that laymen must at once form part of our Convocation. The fact among ourselves is, that we are an established Church; and an intimate union between Church and State is so obviously good in itself, that we would not willingly wish this fact to be altered. Meanwhile we must deal with it as a fact, whether we wish it otherwise or no. Surely, then, in an established church it is most natural that the lay influences should be through the ordinary voice of the country in its secular government. Mutual relations are already established, therefore it is more consistent that whilst they continue to exist, they should be the channel of mutual influence on each other's counsels. But suppose that our Church were at once to admit lay representatives into her synods, in any plan of reformation, which, in itself, all must agree in thinking is most necessary, what would be the consequence? The laity would be represented twice over, through the civil legislature, and also through the deputies present in synod. We see then a reason why the laity ought to be represented in American and also we would say in Scottish church counsels; but we also see that the same result as a whole may be best effected among ourselves by their exclusion. The power of the Crown over the Church is quite sufficient lay influence at present, and unless that is curtailed it would be rash, for the sake of popularity, to admit the same kind of influence under another form also. There is one view of the case, however, which it would require a volume to work out, and which we must therefore leave our readers to adopt for themselves. Between, on the one hand, the entire freedom and non-interference upon religious subjects, which is the policy of the civil government in the United States, and on the other hand, that consistent union between Church and State, which is the original theory of our constitution, there may be degrees and shades of difference in practice, which naturally demand concessions proportioned to them. Even in the altered circumstances of the Church within the bounds of England itself, arising from the policy of the State, there may be such an approach toward severing some bonds of the union between these two powers, as will require some modifications in the representative system of the Church to correspond with it; but in the colonies this applies with peculiar force, since the home government stands in a very different position with the offshoots of the Church in the many branches of our colonial empire, to what is the case in the mother country; a difference well and indignantly illustrated by Mr. Caswall's chapter on the Canadian Church, as well as by what we have already seen to have been the case in America before the establishment of the republic.

With a short passage, however, from Mr. Caswall on what we have just said, we will pass on to his general remarks on the whole subject of synodical action. We need not trouble our readers with the detail of the grievance contained under the subject of 'Clergy Reserves;' but the general impression of our author is thus stated with regard to the treatment of the Church by the civil power. He begins thus:—

'Among the agencies which have contributed to preserve the generous spirit of loyalty in Canada, the Church must undoubtedly be reckoned the principal. And yet it is remarkable that the Church has met with a degree of opposition and even cruelty on the part of the secular authorities, both Imperial and Colonial, which appears the result not so much of a shallow political expediency as of absolute infatuation. In the provinces now forming the United States, the Church was indeed neglected by the British Government, and forbidden to complete her necessary organization. But in Upper Canada she has been stripped of endowments which a republican government would have respected, and at the same time prevented from acting in her own behalf, as an independent body deriving no appreciable benefit from union with the State.'—Pp. 246, 247.

And after stating some particulars, he sums up as follows:—

'It was in consequence of this monstrous combination that the Church lost her University. King's College, as the institution was formerly called, once enjoyed a religious and ecclesiastical character, and from its central situation at Toronto, as well as from other advantages, was well adapted to diffuse a salutary influence. But after the union with Romish Lower Canada was effected, an Act was passed, suppressing King's College, excluding from the University established in its stead all religious instruction whatever, and prohibiting any form of prayer, and every act of public worship within its walls. The Church now requested separate schools for the religious education of her own children, but her prayer was rejected by the votes of Romanists, who, however, managed to secure the very same privileges for themselves.

'From the above statement, it will appear that, although the Canadian Church has suffered bitter opposition as a "State Establishment," and a "Dominant Sect," the State has been, in reality, one of the most powerful enemies with whom she has had to contend. And the severity of this opposition has been aggravated by the very loyalty of the Church, which has made her fear, lest, in defending herself against State aggression, she should endanger the principle of British connexion, and, with it, the very foundations of society.'—Pp. 250, 251.

A somewhat longer extract will be necessary from our author's fair and impartial remarks on the subject of Synods, or we cannot do justice to the prominence given to it in his book. The following passage we commend to the earnest consideration of all Churchmen:—

'Although, in a perfectly united church, Synodical action might be an unmixed benefit, it is very certain that where divisions on matters of principle exist, it does not accomplish so much as sanguine persons might anticipate. Hence in times of controversial excitement, American churchmen look forward to the meetings of their Conventions with anxious apprehension, and regard them as a subject of earnest prayer and suppli-

cation to the Almighty. They know how difficult it is, especially in Diocesan assemblies, to rise above mere local feelings and party prejudices. They are aware that, under such impulses, these Conventions have sometimes committed themselves to a course of action afterwards bitterly regretted. They know also that even the General Convention has not been wholly free from similar dangers, and that great wisdom and forbearance on the part of leading men is often necessary to avert the disastrous effects of faction. At the same time they are fully alive to the value of their Conventional system, knowing how infinitely superior it is to ecclesiastical anarchy, or to Anti-Church legislation on the part of the State. They know that this system simplifies and economises their means, and combines their energies, with a view to definite results. Though harsh sounds occasionally proceed from the machine, they hear in those sounds little but the escape through the regular safety-valve of a power which otherwise might produce a destructive explosion.

Hence it seems to follow that Synodical action on a grand scale, excluding as much as possible merely local and temporary influences, might prove highly beneficial to the whole Church, and at the same time might relieve minor ecclesiastical legislatures from many of the difficulties under which, at present, they are labouring. Could we, for example, suppose the existence of a system of united operation, including both England and America within its sphere, it is quite conceivable that great advantages to each country would be the result. We should not be so much in danger of "measuring ourselves by ourselves, and comparing ourselves among ourselves." Each portion of the Church might supply to the other many of the very elements of which it is particularly in need. It cannot be doubted that various causes, historical and otherwise, retard the advancement of the Church of England, which might be more clearly manifested to us by the unbiassed discrimination of our western brethren. On the other hand, we might contribute our part in elevating their standard of judgment on various important points of doctrine and of practice. We might increase their feelings of reverence and respect for antiquity, and in return receive from them a portion of their elasticity, their perseverance, and their energy.

Measures are now on foot, or partly accomplished, which render it unnecessary to construct a grand scheme of Synodical action by efforts of mere imagination. There exists already the cluster of American dioceses bound together for the last seventy years by the General Convention. Synodical action has commenced, as we have seen, in Canada, under a Bishop, who in his last Charge has expressed an anticipation of a second cluster of dioceses united in a General Synod of British North America. The Australian prelates have made a commencement, which will probably eventuate in a third cluster of extensive dioceses, represented in an Australian Convocation. New Zealand has addressed its noble-minded Bishop on the subject of a General Convention of the Clergy and the Laity residing in that Britain of the Pacific. The Mother Church in England has witnessed earnest and faithful efforts, which may terminate in the establishment of Diocesan Synods, and the revival of the ancient Ecclesiastical Legislature. And to crown the climax of accomplished and anticipated results, the able Bishop of Vermont, in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, has thus expressed himself in regard to the consolidating measure of a Synod of all our Bishops of Great Britain, America, and the Colonies:—

"I fervently hope that the time may come when we shall meet together in the good old fashion of Synodical action. How natural and how reasonable would it seem to be, if 'in a time of controversy and division' there should be a council of all the Bishops in communion with your Grace. And would not such an assemblage exhibit the most solemn, and,

under God, the most influential aspect of *strength* and *unity*, in maintaining the true Gospel. It is my own firm belief that such a measure would be productive of immense advantage, and would exercise a moral influence far beyond that of any secular legislation."

An Anglo-Saxon Synod, like that proposed above, might settle many important questions connected with the promotion of Christianity, and the definition of the doctrines of the Reformation. It could not, indeed, unsettle what General Councils have already lawfully determined; and, however respectable in moral weight, it would be far from possessing the attribute of infallibility. But its members might pray earnestly for Divine assistance, and might consult with learned and grave deliberation. They might devise measures for adapting the Church to its enlarged sphere, by neutralizing as much as possible the causes of weakness and corruption. They might diminish the extent of division by deciding upon many of those subjects which now constitute the rallying points of opposing parties. They might supplant heresy and imposture by drawing forth the divine character of the Church in active and beneficent exercise. They might utter a united voice in behalf of all who are oppressed—they might ascertain the causes which debase and demoralize the poor—they might lay plans for elevating the lower classes generally in the scale of humanity. They might teach the Church how to shake off whatever is effete or unreal, and to become an unworldly and peculiar society. They might display the glory of the divine hierarchy of the Christian Religion, by casting to the winds the false dignity of the world, and going forth, as many of their number have already done, in the faith and devotion of primitive times.

'Then it would be seen that a great and truly Catholic Church can exist and prosper without a Roman Pontiff, without the abuse of images, without fictitious miracles, and without Mariolatry. Then it would appear that neither the local influence of Rome, or of England, or of America, is essential to the efficiency of that spiritual society, which is built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. The same Episcopate to which in the beginning the work of diffusing Christianity was committed, and on which the gracious promises of the Redeemer were conferred, would show itself as the great bond of union, and the main foundation of ecclesiastical strength.'—Pp. 392—396.

It is not our purpose, in these pages, to write a homily, addressed to the Low Church portion of American Churchmen; but we cannot but express regret at some great deficiencies in the Church's practical system, the reformation of which, by the distinctively Church movement of late years, still meets with opposition. The republican spirit of the people is allowed to interfere too much with the reverence and obedience essentially due to the episcopal office, as also it requires the clergy generally to make too large sacrifices of their personal independence, in subservience to the popular will. It is, for instance, with a hope of better feeling and better discipline, in time to come, that we read of the surplice being occasionally given up to the wishes of the congregation, and the Church's ritual and rubrics being so freely altered according to individual tastes. Some things, which seem strange to us, may no doubt be attributed to the long withholding of Bishops from among

them, such as the disregard of consecrated ground, the common uses to which churches are applied, and the neglect of proper reverence to the dead; but bishops have now been enjoyed long enough to make the neglect of these observances no longer so excusable, especially where the prejudice against them is not observed to be wearing away with the removal of their first cause. The alterations also in the Prayer-book, which are sanctioned by General Convention, are a subject of regret, in many respects, without at all calling in question its general power to adapt for themselves the service used in a distant church. But on these things we have not space or inclination to dwell. They form subjects of party feeling in a sister church, with which we have no concern in detail, except so far as the controversies of the American Church sympathise very closely with our own, and that therefore men of each side look for help and sympathy across the Atlantic. Yet, one object of the independence of local churches would be defeated, if party spirit was allowed to spread beyond the bounds of each church; if members of one church were to join in a controversy with the other, about questions which only concern local interests or proprieties. We would therefore be very general in the profession of common cause, and our offers of sympathy with any portion of the Church to the exclusion of others. It would, however, be unreal to disguise the mutual help and strength which the High Church movement, on either side the Atlantic, looks for and gratefully receives from the other. In propagating the broad truths of the universal Church, and in the endeavour to give life to her catholic system, there is no need to be restrained by deference to any local independence. These are subjects about which men of all nations may feel and act alike, and for the furtherance of which, according to their own convictions, men are at liberty to join in close alliance, without any aggression on mutual rights or mutual courtesies; we may therefore openly avow our anxious watching over the success of those Churchmen in America who, in no small strength of zeal, whatever their numbers may be, are striving, by precept and example, to raise the tone of feeling and improve the ecclesiastical arrangements of their Church. Some time back there were seven churches in New York, the centre of the High Church movement, where the Church's daily prayers were offered up, in some cases with considerable care of ritual observance. The proper architectural arrangements of a church are extending far and wide, education prospers, as we have seen, and every means is actively employed for teaching the principles of the Church. The newspapers, for instance, enlisted in the cause, exhibit a freedom, and sometimes, we may say, a prolixity of discussion which is truly

characteristic of the people, but which, nevertheless, we must hail with joy as doing the Church's work and spreading her views, according to the usual methods by which the national habits require that men should form their views. The national character of the American people affords also considerable help in carrying out some of the Church's most cherished principles; and as we have touched on some of the evils of the republican temper, we will also quote Mr. Caswall's testimony as to its advantages.

'Yet if republicanism has its dangerous tendencies, it possesses also its favourable and salutary influences. The practical and business habits of the Clergy and Laity in their Conventions may be traced to this source. There is much in the general *equality* of the people which renders an American parish an encouraging sphere of clerical labour. The prevailing freedom from poverty, as well as from great wealth, removes many temptations to vice, while an almost universal competence promotes intelligence, encourages marriage, and otherwise assists in producing a wholesome state of society. The parishioners possess habits of co-operation, and can assemble together to promote common objects without fearing the loss of dignity from contact with inferiors. And, for the same reason, all of the juvenile members of the flock can be collected in the same Church schools under the care of their common pastor. The people generally, too, are able to comprehend discourses on difficult points of theology or morals, and can appreciate, intellectually, the historical and other arguments by which the cause of the Church is sustained.'—Pp. 286, 287.

The general respect and kindness shown toward the Clergy, as a body, must also be reckoned among the strong points of their position in extending the Church's influence. Of this, our author says as follows:—

'Before, however, we bestow our commiseration on the American Clergy, it may be well to recollect that a large share of worldly *comfort* is an exception to the general experience of the ministers of the Christian Church. Many things which would be a sore mortification to an English Rector, are comparatively unheeded by an elastic American, accustomed to enterprise from his youth, and habituated to the ascendancy of the multitude. If circumstances require him to change his place of abode, like other inhabitants of new countries, he will suffer little from the severance of local attachments. Should he meet with peculiar difficulties in one field of labour, there are many vacant parishes open to him in which he may receive greater encouragement. Small as his income may be, he is not expected to give largely to the poor; for usually the poor, as a considerable class, are not to be found. He pays no direct taxes worth mentioning, and no poor-rates whatever. He is rather the recipient than the dispenser of temporal benefits, while, at the same time, he possesses a few sources of encouragement, already specified, which are not open to the great body of the English Clergy. His exertions will not generally continue long without producing some corresponding result, and if he be moderately faithful to his charge, his heart will soon be gladdened by an enlarging flock, and an increasing number of communicants.

'Many pleasing tokens of respect and kindness are bestowed upon the Clergy, not only by the members of their own congregation, but by comparative strangers. Medical men and lawyers seldom charge them for their

professional services. Sometimes a clergyman receives a wagon load of substantial comforts, such as two or three barrels of flour, a dozen bushels of apples, a barrel of cider, and a sack of coffee. Not unfrequently he is presented with a new silk gown, or even a complete suit of clerical apparel. I have known a Clergyman to receive several fees for marriage of a hundred dollars each, and similar presents at baptisms and funerals. The Missionary Bishops have been conveyed thousands of miles by steamers on the western rivers without expense to themselves. A Clergyman on his way to California was sent free of charge, and in the best style, by the owners of the steamer *Crescent City*, from New York to Chagres. I have myself experienced similar civilities while travelling on the Ohio Canal; and in hotels I have had the amount of my bill presented to me as a token of respect for the clerical character. Some congregations have paid the expenses of their pastor while travelling for many months in search of health. Within the last year, a congregation in Connecticut presented their respected minister with a purse of 300 guineas, to enable him to enjoy the rare gratification of an extensive tour in Europe, including a visit to the Great Exhibition. In fact, those who are conscious of spiritual advantages derived from the Christian ministry, are not generally slow to exhibit manifest tokens of their gratitude.'—Pp. 302—304.

It is impossible that we can conclude our article in more appropriate words than those with which Mr. Caswall ends his book. Expressing, therefore, our truest sympathies with the Churchmen of America, and our best thanks to Mr. Caswall for the useful office he has so nobly taken upon himself, viz. that of promoting, by personal exertions of no mean kind, the mutual intercourse of the two Churches, and their mutual acquaintance with each other, we conclude in his own words:—

'In times of progress not to advance is to recede. The hope of the Church is in going forwards, in "lengthening her cords and strengthening her stakes." Let her labour to place herself right in all questions affecting truth and duty, the interests of humanity, and the promotion of the Divine Glory. Let her address herself to her great work with the help of the new race of faithful sons, now rising up, to meet the varied exigencies of the times. Let her gather up all the zeal, and activity, and learning, and piety, and reverence, and kindness, and love of truth, now existing in her scattered members. Let her seek earnestly for the gifts of strength and wisdom from above, and for the pervading inspiration of that Comforter, without whom she cannot continue in safety. Then, we may trust, that in prophetic language, she will arise and shine, the Lord shall arise upon her, and His glory shall be seen upon her. The Gentiles shall come to her light, and kings to the brightness of her rising.'—Pp. 397, 398.

ART. III.—*De Immaculato B. V. Mariæ conceptu, an dogmatico decreto definiri possit. Disquisitio Theologica* JOANNIS PERRONE, *e Soc. Jes. in Coll. Rom. Theol. Prof.* Avenione: 1848.

LONG and strenuous had been the efforts of the Ultramontane party in the Church of Rome to obtain a formal Papal edict, which should decide that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary is the voice of Scripture and the Church, and enforce the celebration of the festival in consequence; and numerous are the works in which the question is discussed, and such a decision recommended. Walchius, indeed, says of them, ‘Si quis singulos adcurate recensere velit, ‘facili negotio integrum volumen de illis, veluti bibliothecam ‘conficere possit.’ Of these, one of the most able and candid heads our present article. The author’s object is to decide whether or not the doctrine in question has sufficient support in Holy Scripture and Ecclesiastical History to justify the Pope in dogmatically defining it to be an article of the Catholic faith.

But the obscurity and confusion in which the whole question is involved is so great as to make it well nigh hopeless to think of arriving at any clear idea of what, if any such there be, is the real doctrine of the Church of Rome on the subject; for so many minute questions have been raised, and so many subtle distinctions laid down on almost every branch of it, that her doctors have never been able to frame any one statement which should be, even to their own minds, in harmony with the teaching of Holy Scripture, and self-consistent: they are at issue among themselves as to its very first principles and most elementary questions. And hence, among other points on which an authoritative decision is called for, it will be necessary for us to inquire, first, what is the real meaning to be attached to the term ‘Conception’ itself, which, strange as it may appear, has never yet been decided, and about which there are many and grave disputes;—and, secondly, what is, after all, the real object of the festival.

1. Gonzalez of Santalla, in Spain, a Jesuit of the end of the seventeenth century, divides the act into three parts:—1. The material, which precedes the *infusio animæ*;—2. The natural, when the *infusio animæ* is superadded;—3. The spiritual, which is caused by the *infusio sanctificationis*, at the first instant of the animation. But Perrone, with the more modern writers, allows of two parts only, the *conceptio activa*, and *conceptio passiva*; the former, as defined by Benedict XIV., consisting merely of the ‘*corporis formatio, organizatio et dispositio (opere*

‘maritali) ad recipiendam animam rationalem a Deo infunden-
 ‘dam;’ the latter, of the ‘rationalis animæ cum corpore copu-
 ‘latio, quæ fit illo ipso instanti quo rationalis anima, corpori,
 ‘omnibus membris ac suis organis constanti, unitur.’ And to
 account for, and excuse the difference of conclusions between
 S. Bernard, S. Thomas Aquinas, with the whole of the medi-
 æval Church of Rome, and themselves, it is the custom of the
 latter to assume that the former received the word *conceptio* in
 the partial or imperfect sense of the mere ‘formatio fœtus ante
 animationem,’ as they state it to be used in Genesis xvi. 4, and
 2 Sam. xi. 5; whilst they themselves take it in its full and proper
 meaning. Cajetan, however, asserts, and undoubtedly with truth,
 that the ancients, as well as the moderns, are to be understood of
 the whole thing complete and perfect; and it is evidently a pure
 assumption on the part of the moderns, for which they offer no
 shadow of reason or proof, to lay down the distinction they do
 in the Biblical cases alluded to. But it is plain that, whilst
 mere assertions are allowed to stand in the place of proofs, and as
 long as such oppositions and contradictions exist amongst them-
 selves, there can be no certainty to which of her contending
 Doctors and Popes we are to look for the final decision of the
 difficulties of the case; at least, the above distinction is plainly
 built upon a purely arbitrary assumption, supported by no word
 of Revelation, and by no physiological knowledge—on a subject,
 too, on which the Church is necessarily incompetent, from the
 nature of the case, to issue any authoritative decision. If,
 indeed, it proves anything, it proves too much; for if S. Bernard
 and the mediæval doctors allude to one part of the Conception,
 and not the other, their testimony can be of no value whatever,
 and it is useless for Perrone, or any one else, to appeal to it; in
 fact, the moderns are evidently attempting to reduce certain
 unknown physical phenomena within the law of an arbitrary
 Ecclesiastical doctrine which has gradually been constructed by
 themselves.

2. It has next been questioned by some of the most eminent
 of the Romish Doctors, whether the Church celebrates on the
 8th of December, the day dedicated to this festival, the Concep-
 tion itself of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or only the Sanctification,
 which they maintain to have been infused immediately after it.
 S. Thomas Aquinas, and the Church in his time, decidedly held
 the latter;¹ but this opinion, though confessed to be not only

¹ We may be pardoned for offering to our readers a specimen of the manner in
 which a Romish controversialist allows himself to speak on a subject, the truth or
 falsehood of which being absolute, cannot possibly depend on any accidental ques-
 tion of time, or on the dictum of any individual Pope. ‘Although S. Thomas, and
 others of the ancients who wrote before Sixtus IV., offered this explanation of the
 festival of the Conception, piously and praiseworthy enough, it cannot be endured

allowable, but even meritorious, before the Bull of Sixtus IV. in 1481, is condemned as utterly inexcusable, 'now that that document has laid it down, that the object of the festival is 'not the *conceptio spiritualis*, but *naturalis*;' an assertion made by Sixtus with the utmost confidence, but which it is not for us to reconcile with the fact, that a century or more after his time, the word *Sanctificatio* occupied in the office of the festival of the Conception the place of *Conceptio*, the former term having been thrust out to make room for the latter by Pope Gregory in the beginning of the seventeenth century: whilst in the ancient statutes of the Carthusians 'De rebus Sacris,' made and allowed in the thirteenth century, we find these words—'In festo de Conceptione Beatae Virginis Mariæ dicatur, loco conceptionis, sanctificationis.'—Mabillon Annal. Appendix, Vol. vi. p. 687, No. 45.

The fact is, that Sixtus IV. issued bulls, the foundation of others in after times, in favour of a doctrine clearly opposed to that, not only of the greatest Doctors of his Church, but, as we shall presently show, of more than one of his predecessors in the chair of S. Peter; it is therefore impossible, even on Perrone's own principles, that such a rule can have any real claim to the authority which he would demand for it.

3. Again, it has been doubted by Bandell, Master General of the order of Preachers in the beginning of the sixteenth century, firstly, whether the festival of the 8th of December refers to any Immaculateness at, or immediately after, the Conception, and not rather to the sanctity which was undoubtedly conferred upon the Blessed Virgin Mary after the Annunciation, and when she was overshadowed by the Holy Ghost; and, secondly, whether anything more is intended to be commemorated than that she was, through the birth of Christ, to be, as the office expresses it, 'the source of rejoicing to all the world,' of which, as the first fruit, her Conception was made an object of especial observance; an opinion to which even Bellarmine gives his approbation, saying, in his book 'De Cultu Sanctorum,'—'The foundation of this festival was 'not the Immaculate Conception, but merely the Conception of 'her who should be the Mother of God; for whatever were that 'Conception itself, in respect that it was the Conception of the 'Mother of God, the memory of it causes a singular rejoicing 'to the world; for then we first had a certain pledge of redemp-

now that the Roman Church has openly declared that she celebrates, as holy, the formal and perfect Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, at the moment of her animation. The case, however, of those who wrote before, and after Sixtus IV. is different . . . for it was the endeavour of all the ancient Doctors to persuade the people that the Church, on the 8th of December, did not celebrate the carnal Conception which took place on that day, but the spiritual, when grace was infused into her, either at the first moment of her conception, or subsequently.'—Gonzalez of Santalla, sect. vii. p. 51. 4to. Dilingæ: 1690.

'tion, especially since she was conceived, not without a miracle, 'from a sterile mother. Hence, even they who hold the Blessed Virgin Mary to have been conceived in sin, celebrate this 'festival.'—Book iii. chap. 16.

The fact is, that the Church of Rome has no one doctrine of paramount authority on the subject: thus we find her at two different periods of her history holding two different fundamental doctrines, each of which has been received as the truth, and supported by Papal authority; yet as they are distinguished from one another not by any mere verbal refinements or distinctions, but by a difference of essential and germinal ideas, it is impossible in any manner to reconcile them together, and in consequence their respective maintainers cannot avoid opposing and contradicting one another. One dates from and supports itself by S. Bernard, and the other is that in favour of which Perrone has composed his disquisition. The former teaches that the Blessed Virgin Mary was freed from sin by infusion of grace *after* her Conception, and so that she was, as S. Bernard urges, like Jeremiah and John the Baptist, 'sanctificata in utero,' having been for a point of time under the bond of original sin; the latter, that she was conceived immaculate, being in fact not 'sanctificata' but 'sancta,' and therefore that there never was even a moment of time when she was not holy; in which case, as S. Thomas Aquinas urges, she could have had no need whatever of redemption.¹

The Church of Spain, which, as is well known, stood foremost in the twelfth and following centuries as the champion of the cause, adopted the former theory, holding in common with all the mediævalist Doctors, after S. Bernard, much as follows: that the Blessed Virgin Mary at the first moment of her existence needed redemption, and was in some degree under the contagion of original sin, in which therefore she could rightly be said to have been conceived, as being an offspring of Adam, and naturally born of parents, themselves lying under the penalties of his first transgression. Hence for that point of time, however long or short, she stood in need, like all other merely human creatures, of sanctifying grace; but this grace was communicated to her 'in utero,' in such a degree as to free her from all taint of original sin, and to make her what cooperating Grace ever after-

¹ Gonzalez says that the asserters of the 'pia sententia,' or Romish doctrine—that is, as it was known in his day—affirm her not only 'debitum habuisse contrahendi maculam originalem cum fuit in lumbis parentum atque etiam in sui conceptione, sed etiam in ipso primo instante animationis' (P. 118.) And Launoy tells us that it was the original tradition of the Church of Rome that Mary was for a brief 'morula' under sin, because, according to all, as soon as she could be sanctified she was sanctified, and in consequence that Christ alone was conceived without all sin.

wards continued her, a fitting temple for Him, the only sinless One. But it would probably be difficult to find a more remarkable illustration of the words of Suarez than in this controversy. 'Quod uno tempore est probabile,' (that is as far as the Church of Rome is concerned,) 'decursu temporis potest improbabile fieri.' Perrone now rejects the opinion of his own Doctors, exceeding as it does, and not falling short of the voice of Holy Scripture and the early Church on the subject,—both of which teach her to be one who, though blessed among women, is still essentially a merely human creature, and as such subject to the laws of the rest of her kind,—as little better than what he terms the 'impia sententia of the enemy,' and thereby, as far as in him lies, consigns them—S. Bernard, S. Peter Lombard, S. Thomas Aquinas, S. Bonaventura, and others of the like exalted stamp, both of moral and intellectual character—to utter condemnation. His own system is based on a determined denial that there ever was so much as a single moment of time in which the Blessed Virgin Mary lay under any taint of original sin whatever. He will not allow a 'liberatio,' but he claims for her an 'exemptio.' He requires an absolute freedom from all sin, not by purification after, but by perfection before her Conception, and he creates in consequence a spotlessness which does not admit, as it does not require, any cleansing whatever; but, with all his learning and ability, he entirely fails in showing (as might indeed have been expected) that this is anything more at most than the opinion of a very small portion of the doctors of the Church of Rome. In discussing the question as we propose to do, we shall first endeavour to give a brief sketch of the history of the doctrine, and then examine how far it is in accordance with the teaching of Holy Scripture, with those systems and historical assertions of antiquity which bear upon the subject, and, lastly, with the voice of the Church of Rome herself, as declared not only by those of her writers whose names carry with them the greatest weight and authority, but even by the authoritative and explicit declarations of former Popes.

The first cause of the question being raised was, as Perrone rightly says, the conduct of the Canons of Lyons, who, about the year 1140, adopted the festival of the Immaculate Conception, which had lately been introduced into some of the Churches of France.¹ S. Bernard remonstrated with them in a letter in

¹ It is doubtful, says Perrone, whence the doctrine first originated, or how it came into France. He thinks that it was originally derived from the East, and was celebrated at Naples in the ninth century, 300 years before S. Bernard; but, as he observes, the language of S. Bernard is against this view, since he describes it as a 'nova celebritas quam ritus Ecclesiasticus nescit . . . et non commendat antiqua traditio . . .' 'Some writers,' he says, 'have ascribed its origin to France, and even to England, in the latter case deriving it' (but erroneously) 'from

which, having expressed his wonder that the Church of Lyons, the first in the country both in position and authority, should be willing to forfeit its good name by introducing a new 'celebritas' of which Ecclesiastical 'ritus' knows nothing, which reason does not approve, nor ancient tradition recommend,' he proceeds: 'Most firmly do I hold with the Church, "eam in utero accepisse ut sancta prodiret."'" He then compares her with Jeremiah: 'Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee;' and with S. John the Baptist: 'He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb;' and he continues:—

'The Mother of God also was, without doubt, Sanctified before she was born, nor is the holy Church in error in accounting the day of her Nativity holy; I think that even a more abundant blessing of Sanctification descended on her, which not only Sanctified her birth, but also preserved her life from all sin, which happened to none other of the children of men. It was becoming, indeed, that the Queen of Virgins should pass her life in the privilege of a singular Sanctity, and free from all sin, who, in bearing the Destroyer of all sin and death, obtained for all the gift of life.

'Whence, then, is the Sanctity of her Conception? Can she be said to have been prevented by Sanctification, as being already holy when conceived, and thus her Conception itself was also holy? But she could not be holy before she existed, as she existed not before she was conceived. Or, again, did Holiness attach to her conception, "inter amplexus maritales," so that she was, at the same time, both sanctified and conceived? But reason admits not this; for how can there be Holiness without the Holy Spirit to sanctify, or how could there be any union between the Holy Spirit and sin? or, again, how was there not sin where there was concupiscence? unless it be said, indeed, that she also was conceived of the Holy Ghost and not of a human father, which is hitherto unheard of. I affirm that the Blessed Virgin conceived, and not that she also was conceived by a virgin; otherwise where is her prerogative as the Mother of God, by which she alone is believed to exult both in the gift of an offspring and in the spotlessness of her body, if you ascribe the same to her mother also? This is not to increase, but to detract from her honour.

'If, then, she could neither be sanctified before her Conception, since she did not then exist, nor in it, on account of the sin which was inherent in the act, it remains to be believed that she received Sanctification whilst

S. Anselm.' Bulæus, in his History of the School of Paris, tells us that the Church of Lyons began the festival from no Papal authority, but because they affirmed themselves to be in possession of a document from Heaven directing its observance, 'Scriptum aliquod cœlitus delapsum in quo Beata Virgo Maria mandabat placere sibi festum illud celebrari.'—Tom. ii. p. 135.

¹ The Benedictines truly observe on this, that S. Bernard admits no difference between Jeremiah, S. John, and the Blessed Virgin Mary, except that he allows her to have had a more abundant share of grace than they. 'In utero,' they say, 'sanctificatos affirmat omnes, immunem a culpa originali nullum.' In fact so far is S. Bernard from falling short of true Catholic language on the subject, though differing essentially from modern Rome, that he speaks much more highly of the sanctity of the Blessed Virgin Mary than the early Fathers would bear him out in doing. 'Ante sancta quam nata,' benedictio . . . quæ . . . vitam ab omni . . . peccato custodiret immunem,' are modern doctrines, and we may thus perceive that the more moderate of the two phases of the Romish system dates from him, and is supported by the great authority of his name.

yet existing in her mother's womb, which, excluding sin, made her nativity holy, but not her Conception also. Wherefore, although it is granted to a few among the sons of men to be born in Holiness, it is not also granted them to be conceived holy; and thus to one alone would be reserved the prerogative of a holy Conception, even to Him who should sanctify all men, coming, alone of all, without sin, to make a cleansing of sins. Our Lord Jesus Christ, then, alone, was conceived of the Holy Ghost, who was alone holy even before His conception; He only excepted, to all the other offspring of Adam apply the words spoken by one in humility and truth of himself—"I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."

'Since this is so,' he concludes, 'what reason can be given for the festival of the Conception? In what manner. I say, is a Conception asserted to be holy which is not of the Holy Ghost,—not to say which is of sin; or will that be accounted a festival which is not holy? The Blessed Virgin Mary will gladly forego a distinction by which either sin shall receive honour, or a false sanctity appear to be introduced.'

We have dwelt the longer on this letter, not only as it is that to which the mediæval writers are accustomed to appeal in support of the doctrine, which they also hold, of a *sanctificatio in utero*, and which they trace back to this document as the original cause of its introduction into the Church, but because the force of the negative and destructive arguments contained in it, together with its author's well-known ability and sanctity, as well as his great authority as a Canonized Saint of his Church, form the chief reason why the more extravagant opinion, held by Perrone in the present day, and foreshadowed in the times of S. Bernard, did not long ago pass, by Papal rule, into a formal article of the faith of the Church of Rome, as it is assuredly the source to which those of that Church who would base their faith on some foundation more sure than the mere dictum of a single Pope, must now look for a continuation of that toleration which former Pontiffs have been ready, and even eager to extend to the original and really Catholic doctrine, which knows no essential difference between the Blessed Virgin Mary and other merely human creatures, and of which, in consequence, Perrone cannot now venture openly to recommend the withdrawal.

After, we should rather say contemporary with, S. Bernard, was the well-known Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, who lays down, in the 3d book of the 'Sentences,' a doctrine which, as we shall shortly see, agrees in all essential particulars with that of S. Bernard, and which was followed by those writers who employed themselves—chiefly in the thirteenth century—in commenting on that work; among whom we meet the illustrious names of Alexander of Hales, our own countryman, Albertus Magnus, S. Thomas Aquinas, his pupil, and S. Bonaventura.

A century and a half later, the festival of the Immaculate Conception was observed in the Oratory of the Roman Church, in the presence of the College of Cardinals, and by the efforts of

Nicolas III., or, as some say, of Clement V., his successor;¹ an example which was followed by several of the religious orders,—the Benedictines, the Cistercians, the Coelestines (a branch of the Benedictines), the Carmelites, the Trinitarians, the Redemptionists, and others. From this time began those contentions between the rival orders of S. Dominic and S. Francis, which are so closely connected with the question at issue; the former, as a whole, upholding the doctrine of S. Thomas Aquinas, and the latter taking the part, as they suppose, of J. D. Scotus. The agitation was kept alive by John de Montesono, a Spaniard of the order of Preachers, and a Doctor of Paris, who in the year of 1387 delivered, at that city, certain theses, or propositions, in one of which he affirmed that it was as contrary to Scripture to say that any one man was exempt from original sin, except Christ only, as to say that ten were so; or to assert that the Blessed Virgin Mary was not conceived in it, as to say, ‘*illam fuisse beatam et viatricem ab instanti suæ conceptionis vel sanctificationis, vel fuisse unitam hypostaticè*’ (*sic*). For this the faculty of Paris passed a censure on him, which was confirmed by the Antipope, Clement VII., to whom he appealed at Avignon, and by Urban VI., to whom he next carried the cause, at Rome, and he himself, as it appears, was imprisoned. As an instance of the principles of Montesonus’ opponents of the Ultramontanist party, we may perhaps be allowed to offer the following extract from Alexander Natalis:—‘Montesonus had affirmed, in his 9th Proposition, that “to assert any thing as true which is contrary to Scripture, is most expressly against the faith.” This was condemned as false, and injurious to the Saints and Doctors; and rightly so, said Peter de Alliaco, one of his opponents, and afterwards bishop of Camerara and Cardinal; because there are many contradictory propositions to be found disputed among them, of which some are against Scripture, but none expressly opposed to the faith.’²

The Council of Basle was held in the year 1439. In its 36th session it decreed that the assertion ‘*gloriosam Dei genitricem Mariam, præveniente et operante Divini Numinis gratia singulari, nunquam actualiter subjacuisse originali peccato, sed immunem fuisse semper ab omni originali et actuali culpa, sanctamque et immaculatam, tanquam piam, et consonam cultui Ecclesiastico, fidei Catholicæ, rectæ rationi, et sacræ Scripturæ; et ab omnibus Catholicis approbandam fore et amplectendam.*’ But, as Perrone confesses, the Council, even when using such strong language as this, carefully abstained from declaring it to be a positive article of faith.

¹ Perrone, p. 30.

² Alex. Natalis, History, thirteenth Century, vol. xx. p. 505.

From this decree, however, and not, as some say, from a disputation of J. Duns Scotus, the University of Paris adopted the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and forced it upon its members,—‘That we may see,’ they say, ‘the holy decree of the Council approved by the judgment, consent, and reverence, of all the Churches, and of the whole Christian people, we cannot but wonder at the vain pride, and rash and insane obstinacy of some . . . who, in our time, hesitate not to oppose or call in question the holy and religious doctrine of this Universal Council and the Church, which, according to Christ’s promise, cannot err.’ They then proceed to order, first, that no one be henceforth enrolled a member of their University, who will not undertake to advance the doctrine with ‘all his powers;’ and, secondly, that any one already belonging to it, who ‘in contempt, not only of the University, but of the Council and the Church, whose authority is supreme, shall venture to uphold the opposite one, shall be deprived of all his honours, and cast out of its society as an ethnic and publican.’¹ If we are not surprised to find the Gallican Church so strongly supporting a Council, one of whose acts was to depose the dominant Pope, yet it is at least singular that Perrone, an Italian and a follower of Ignatius Loyola, should appeal to its authority, and that when he does not hesitate to term ‘it ἀκέφαλος et schismatica.’ It is instructive to glance at the list of names given by Launoy, whom the above decree declared to be, in fact, heretical. It contains, amongst others, those of two Popes, Clement VI. and Innocent V., as well as S. Peter Lombard, S. Thomas Aquinas, S. Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, and others.

It was nearly forty years later that Sixtus IV. issued his celebrated Constitutions, the first of which only causing fresh disturbances, necessitated the publication of a second, to explain and support it, and put an end to the growing scandals and offences. It condemns and excommunicates both those who assert and those who deny that the holders of the Immaculate Conception are guilty of heresy—‘cum nondum sit a Romana Ecclesia et Apostolica sede decisum.’ It was these Constitutions, which, as might be expected, were far from finally settling the question, that the Council of Trent directed to be observed and republished: it being, as we learn from Palavicini, through the exertions of the Dominicans, supported by the bishops of Spain, that the strenuous efforts of Cardinal Pacecho to have the doctrine finally decided, or at least acknowledged with favour by the majority of the Council, were finally overruled, and a declaration, signifying their desire to leave the whole question open,

¹ Alex. Natalis, vol. xx. p. 587, &c.

drawn up and affixed to the decree 'De originali Peccato.' It runs thus:—'Declarat tamen hæc sancta synodus non esse suæ intentionis, comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem, Matrem, Dei genetricem, sed observandas esse constitutiones felicitis recordationis Sixti Papæ IV., sub pœnis in eis constitutionibus contentis, quas innovat.' The case then, in the Council, stood much as Gonzalez describes it: 'It was agreed upon that nothing should be done, by which any cause of strife should be administered to the Catholic party, nor that any term should be introduced, by which anything could be detracted from either side of the question,' so that when the suffrages were taken anew, and the meeting unusually protracted, it came to this point,—that although many considered the Blessed Virgin Mary to have been conceived without sin, an equal number, on the other hand, thought it more expedient to detract nothing from the opposite opinion.'

Pius V. soon after the Council issued a Constitution in which he gave permission for the defence of either side in the dispute, although at the same time he forbade the question to be handled 'in vernacula lingua,' and he finally inserted in the Roman reformed Breviary and Missal an office, 'De Virginis Conceptu,' with a mass to be read on the 8th of December, ordering for the sake of unity both the office and mass for the Nativity to be adapted to the festival of the Conception, with the alteration of the word 'Nativitas' into 'Conceptio.'¹ But not even thus were the divisions and disturbances finally terminated. Paul V., in the year 1616, retraced the steps made in advance by his predecessors, and once more left it open to each party to follow freely its own opinion; and when the kings of Spain, whose dominions were much harassed by the contention, subsequently endeavoured to obtain a final decision on the subject, both he and Gregory XV. his successor. A.D. 1622, contented themselves with imposing silence on those who were inclined to deny the new doctrine;² or, as Mosheim graphically describes it:—

'If the Pontiffs were awed, on the one hand, by the warm remonstrances of the Spanish Court, which favoured the sentiments of the Franciscans, they were restrained, on the other, by the credit and influence of the Dominicans. So that after the most earnest entreaties and importunities, all that could be obtained from the Pontiff by the Court of Spain was a

¹ Perrone, p. 43.

² Gregory XV., according to Gonzalez, brought the Dominicans to the custom of the Church; 'Not,' he says, 'directly obliging them to judge speculatively that the Blessed Virgin Mary was preserved from original sin in her Conception, but compelling them to conform themselves to the practical judgment of the Church in celebrating under that title what she intends to keep, namely, the Conception as immaculate.' (P. 60.) In other words, he required them to keep the festival, but not to believe the doctrine.

declaration, intimating that the opinion of the Franciscans had a high degree of probability on its side, and forbidding the Dominicans to oppose it in a public manner; but this declaration was accompanied by another, by which the Franciscans were prohibited, in their turn, from treating as erroneous the doctrine of the Dominicans.'

It is little to be wondered at that such conduct should have provoked the sarcasm which immediately follows:—

'This pacific accommodation of matters would have been highly laudable in a prince or civil magistrate, who, unacquainted with Theological questions of such an abstruse nature, preferred the tranquillity of his people to the discussion of such an intricate and unimportant point; but whether it was honourable to the Roman Pontiff, who boasts of a divine right to decide all religious controversies, and pretends to a degree of inspiration which places him beyond the possibility of erring, we leave to the consideration of those who have his glory at heart.'—Century xviii. sect. ii. part i. § 48.

In the year 1661, however, Alexander VII., at the joint entreaty of the Church and Crown of Spain, issued a Constitution in favour of the doctrine, which Perrone describes as 'vere sigillum quo superiora decreta omnia obsignavit,' though he is obliged to admit, 'nec quisquam vere Catholicorum vel hiscere deinceps est ausus, si irreligiosos nonnullos scriptores neotericos excipias, inter quos principem sibi locum vindicat Launoius,' 'atque in extremis hisce fere annis Georgius Hermesius.' Still the question was not so finally decided even by this decree but that Clement XI. found it necessary to re-establish the festival in the year 1708; and lastly, Gregory XVI., in the year 1834, at the petition of certain Bishops of the Gallican Church, ordered, 1, that the word 'Immaculata' should be added to the Preface of the Mass of the Conception, celebrated on the second Sunday in

'Few, indeed, have been the champions more able to support and make good their cause than Launoy, and Perrone seems to feel this, if we may judge from the number of pages, and the amount of labour which he has bestowed, though in vain, to his confutation. Launoy does not hesitate to speak most strongly in condemnation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and, to Perrone's great wrath, he reflects severely on the conduct of the Popes in permitting its introduction. 'After Clement VI.,' he says, 'the tradition of the Apostolic See was diminished and deformed; for Sixtus IV., a Franciscan, held in equal respect the novel doctrine of Scotus, and the tradition of the Apostolic See and Church of Rome, being persuaded that the latter was no other than the opinion of the Preachers. O impudence! O utter contempt of the Apostolic See and of the Pontiffs his predecessors! For he approved an office of the Conception by one Leonard of Nogarole, which the Church of Rome was unwilling to receive, as appears from a letter on the sacred rites of the Roman Church, which Christopher Marcellus, Archbishop of Ancyra, wrote in the time of Pope Leo X., and dedicated to that Pontiff in the year 1515. In that work the festivals of Mary are marked, namely, the Purification, the Annunciation, the Assumption, and the Birth-day. On the Conception it is wholly silent. This is to be considered as the remains of the tradition of the Church of Rome, which subsequent Popes obscured and destroyed, especially Alexander VII., who, in a decree on this subject, recounts all that Bonaventura and other Doctors objected to him, in favour of the Immaculate Conception. This, I say, he did to show to which side he himself inclined.'—Præscrip. ix. p. 20.

Advent, with the grant of a plenary indulgence to such of the faithful as should join in celebrating the festival; ¹ and, 2, that among her other encomia she should be addressed in the Litanies of Loretto, 'Regina sine labe originali concepta;' rules which the present Pope, in the year 1847, confirmed and renewed.²

'Atque hic,' says Perrone, when dismissing this branch of the subject, 'fuit exitus quem hactenus habuit controversaria istæ, quæ a tenuibus exorta principiis, longo seculorum serie post tot contentiones et disceptationes ita progressa est, ut pia sententia magis ac magis in annos invaluerit, donec sola in Ecclesia Catholica sit dominata, atque universali unoque *pene* consensu, excepta fuerit ac propugnata.'—*Perrone*, p. 50.

From the history, we will now turn to the proofs of this doctrine, as offered by the Church of Rome; premising that the whole question being strictly one of *fact*, it is plain that conclusions drawn from mere hypothesis, probability, or conjecture alone, must be wholly insufficient for its establishment, and that in consequence it must be treated historically, and proved, if at all, by plain dogmatic assertions, first—as to the principle, at least, on which it is based—of Holy Scripture; and, secondly, of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church at large. This indeed Perrone admits, when he says, 'Siquidem cum agitur de dogmate agitur de facto: factum autem idoneis tantum testibus, minime vero conjecturis solisve ratiocinationibus est comprobandum.' (*Perrone*, *Proœm.* p. xii.) And, I. of the Biblical testimonies, Perrone candidly admits that against it are to be ranked all such inspired assertions as declare, 1, that the original sin of Adam has descended to all his posterity alike; and, 2, that, in consequence of this fact, all without exception stand in need of the redemption of the cross; or, in which, in Perrone's more emphatic words, 'Redemptionis necessitas quoad omnes pariter et singulos, per Christi merita asseritur.'

Under the first class come such assertions as those in Job xiv. 4: 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.' Ps. li. 5: 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin hath my mother conceived me.' Rom. iii. 23: 'For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;' v. 12: 'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.' Ephes. ii. 3: 'Among whom also we all had our conversation in

¹ Cumque in Gallis festum Conceptionis ex præcepti obligatione non celebretur, plurimorum Episcoporum illius regni precibus idem summus Pontifex annuit, ut Dominica secunda Adventus singulis annis Missa de Conceptione una cum adjecta voce "*Immaculata*," in præfatione cani aut legi posset; concessa præterea indulgentia plenaria fidelibus omnibus rite comparatis, qui ad Ecclesiam festi celebrandi causa, se conferrent.—*Perrone*, p. 49, and see *Appendix*, p. 355.

² Perrone, p. 49, and Appendices 1, 2, pp. 354—357, and 385—392.

'times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.' To which it may be surely allowed us to add, that the whole complex of subjective Christianity is so rooted and grounded on the same primary truth, that the failure of it in any one instance would at least go near to render the whole null and void.

A few instances of the second fact may be found in S. Paul's emphatic, and surely final, assertions to the Romans, v. 18: 'Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.' To the Corinthians, I. xv. 22: 'As in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive;' II. v. 15: 'And that he died for *all*.' On which Perrone allows that it is urged, and *à priori* with perfect truth, that as they are universal dicta and admit no exception, it is inferred that the Blessed Virgin Mary is also included in them; otherwise both classes of assertion—viz. that of the universal propagation of original sin in all alike, and of the consequent redemption of all and each alike, 'nutare videntur—ab hoc vero Catholica fides abhorret.' And, he continues, no reason appears why the Blessed Virgin Mary should be exempted 'a labis primogeniæ contagione;' but the same may be urged with equal cogency in the case of others, as S. Bernard argues in his letter to the Canons of Lyons. And thus, an opening once being made, more and more would at length be held to have been free from the same infection. In order therefore to the proof of a true and rightful exemption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, it is by all means necessary that some Biblical assertion, which cannot be thought doubtful, should be brought forward. 'Atqui,' he concludes, 'hic quidem non suppetit, sequitur proinde communi generalique lege Deiparam comprehendendi.' To which we can only say, that if he had produced anything on the other side of the question only half as forcible and really Catholic as this, he would have imparted to our own minds no small portion of that doubt under which he describes himself as having at one period laboured. But the best argument that he is able to bring forward for the Romish system is, that the force of those Scriptural assertions, which apparently tend the other way, has been in fact destroyed by subsequent Papal decrees, and by the rule of the Council of Trent,—an assertion, by the way, in which an authority, such as was expressly repudiated for himself by an inspired Apostle, is glibly and without hesitation claimed for a Pope and a local Council. We may well question what claim a doctrine has to our acceptance which rests on such a foundation as this. Perrone, how-

ever, has done injustice, at least, to the latter of his authorities. The Council of Trent expressly abstained from issuing any decision on the subject, and contented itself with merely affixing to its decree *De originali Peccato*:—‘Declarat tamen hæc ipsa ‘Sancta Synodus non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in ‘hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Matrem Dei genitricem, sed observandas esse ‘constitutiones felicis recordationis Sixti Papa IV. sub pœnis in ‘eis constitutionibus contentis, quas innovat.’ And the authenticity even of this addition has been doubted.¹

On the other side of the question, Perrone at once asserts that the texts ‘quæ in virginei privilegii commendationem a fautoribus congeruntur plura sunt;’ and yet immediately confesses the *πρωτεύον* which was spoken to Eve after her fall, to be ‘præcipuum tamen ac vere unicum quod in rem nostram profertur.’ The bearing of it he thus explains: ‘Hoc ‘ipso mulieris victoria in dæmonem prænunciatur, seu in peccatum: porro haud perfecta censi mulieris victoria posset, si ‘et ipsa aliquando peccato fuisset obnoxia—eo videlicet temporis puncto quo primum fuit concepta.’ Others which might be cited being, he says, applied only in a mystical sense, and deriving their force ‘vel a doctorum expositione vel ex usu Ecclesiæ;’ and, therefore, however little to be rejected ‘a viro Catholico,’ they are ‘minus accommoda’ to the question of how far the doctrine proposed may be ruled dogmatically as an article of the faith.² With such a meagre display of authority from the Old Testament, worse, indeed, it may be thought, than none at all, he offers one more from the New Testament, the angelic salutation to Mary, Luke i. 28. But how the words of that salutation apply to the doctrine in question, he gives us no idea whatever, merely saying that ‘they derive their force from ‘the exposition of the Fathers, and of themselves supply nothing ‘more to its support than mere conjectures.’ Perrone then allows, on the one hand, the assertion, that, to establish the ‘true exemption of the Blessed Virgin Mary from original sin, ‘some Biblical text must be brought forward, the force of ‘which is by no means dubious, but in which such exemption ‘should be plainly expressed,’ (p. 53;) and yet, on the other hand, he has ventured to bring forward only two, neither of which can he pretend to have any direct bearing on the question whatever; so that, by his own admission, the doctrine in question cannot be considered an article of faith necessary to salvation. ‘Innumera prope Sanctorum veterum Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum testimonia,’ he says, when addressing himself,

¹ Launoy, *Præscription*. xi. p. 23.

² Page 74, &c.

after Holy Scripture, to the subject of those of the Fathers who appear to be opposed to his doctrine, 'cum quaestio maxime faveret, prolata in medium sunt, quæ piæ sententiæ adversari omnino viderentur,'—words which he afterwards endeavours to qualify; but, as his efforts are crowned with no manner of success, they must be allowed to retain their first force.

II. Of uninspired authorities Perrone makes five great distinctions, all of which, however, may safely be reduced to two:—1, those who say that our Lord Jesus Christ, and no other, is without all sin; and, 2, those who assert that the whole human race is infected with original sin, *quin Beatam Virginem speciatim nominent*. Under this latter class come those who, as he tells us, say, 'Beatam Matrem sanctificatam mundatam fuisse.'¹ And he certainly furnishes us with some extremely strong and remarkable assertions on this side of the question,—assertions sufficient, we should think, to close it at once to those who had in view the one sole object of the discovery of the truth, and who would prefer the voice of the whole early Church to the rules of individual Popes, even were these so consistent and uniform as they are, in fact, diversified and mutually opposed.

Thus, as to the first class,—to select a few of the most important of his authorities, he refers us, as against his own doctrine, to the words of S. Augustine, 'De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione,' (book ii. chap. 24, § 38; tom. x. p. 61.) 'Solutus ergo ille etiam, homo factus, manens Deus, peccatum nullum habuit unquam; nec sumpsit carnem peccati, quamvis de materna carne peccati. Quod enim carnis inde suscepit, id profecto aut suscipiendum mundavit, aut suscipiendo mundavit.' It should be borne in mind that the piece in question was written by S. Augustine expressly to oppose the Pelagian doctrine that there are and would be men who have no sin at all whatever,—'Quod in hac vita sint, et futuri sint homines nullum habentes omnino peccatum,' as the Benedictine preface of the book in question emphatically expresses it. Here, then, if anywhere, we should expect an exception to the rule, did any such, in S. Augustine's opinion, exist,—except only the one so carefully specified. None such, however, is to be found; the whole genius of the piece is opposed to there being any. He does especially except Christ, and Christ *only*. He therefore, by necessity, includes all others, and of course, even the Blessed Virgin Mary among them.

From S. Fulgentius,² 'De Incarnatione,' Perrone next cites the following passage:—

¹ Page 57.

² Cave, Hist. Litt. i. 404. Dupin, vol. v.

'Deus qui venit peccata tollere quia peccatum in eo non est, homo conciperetur atque nasceretur in similitudine carnis peccati, de carne peccati. Caro quippe Mariæ, quæ in iniquitatibus humana fuerit solemnitate concepta, caro fuit utique peccati quæ Filium Dei genuit in similitudine carnis peccati... Si enim caro peccati, non mendaciter dicitur, habet in se caro ipsa peccatum. Si peccatum vero non habet, falsum portat carnis peccati vocabulum. Sed eam de qua loquimur, carnem peccati verax discipulus veritatis Paulus appellat. Restat igitur ut sicut vere caro est cum caro dicitur—ita vere in se peccatum habeat, cum caro peccati ore Apostolico appellatur.'—*Fulgentius*, chap. vi.

'Caro Christi,' says Ferrand, S. Fulgentius's friend and disciple, 'carni Mariæ est similis, et dissimilis; similis quia inde traxit originem, dissimilis quia non inde contraxit vitiatæ originis contagionem.' If in Ferrand's opinion there had been no 'contagio' to contract, Christ could not have been 'dissimilis' in that he did not contract it. We may therefore fairly conclude that the doctrine of Perrone was not that of the Church of Africa in the sixth century. Dupin tells us, moreover, that S. Fulgentius was a careful follower, not only of the matter, but even of the manner of S. Augustine.¹

Perrone observes (p. 85), that among other points in favour of what he terms the 'pia sententia,' are the 'comparisons' made by some of the early Fathers and others between Eve and the Blessed Virgin Mary; 'the one through listening to the serpent having been the origin of sin, the other through faith in the message of the angel becoming that of salvation.' 'Quod alligavit Eva virgo per incredulitatem hoc Virgo Maria solvit per fidem,' says S. Irenæus, (lib. iii. cap. 34, p. 262, Grabe;) and again: 'Quemadmodum astrictum est morti genus humanum per Virginem, salvatur per Virginem, æqua lance deposita virginali inobedientia per Virginalem obedientiam,' (bk. v. chap. 19, p. 429;)—and Tertullian: 'In Virginem enim adhuc Evam irreperat verbum ædificatorium mortis, in Virgine æque introducendum erat Dei Verbum exstinctorium vitæ, ut quod per ejusmodi sexum abierat in perditionem, per eundem sexum redigeretur in salutem. Crediderat Eva serpenti, credidit Maria Gabrieli: quod illa credendo deliquit, hæc credendo delevit,' &c. (De Carne Christi, § 17, p. 321;)—and S. Epiphanius: 'Eve indeed became the cause of death to man, for through her death entered into the world; but Mary was made the cause of life, through whom life was born to us.' (Her. 78, § 18, p. 1051.) We wonder that the real force of these and similar passages has escaped Perrone. Eve and the Blessed Virgin Mary are here, in truth, not compared, but opposed to and contrasted with one another. The former was, by

¹ Cave, Hist. Litt. i. 514. Dupin, vol. v.

original creation, without sin, but, by her own act of disobedience and want of faith, she both committed sin herself and entailed it on her descendants. Mary, on the other hand, a daughter of that fallen mother did, by her personal faith and obedience, so far as in her lay, repair the evil. Yet, opposed as they are in other respects, there *is* one point of resemblance between them, but it is an accidental one merely, their *παρθενία*. No one can imagine, and none of the Fathers think of asserting, that the existence of this Grace in Eve, without original sin at first, involves its existence in a like state of spotlessness in Mary afterwards, any more than they assert that Eve's maternity after the fall necessitates the like in Mary after the birth of Christ, which they, *uno ore*, repudiate. In a word, it is a contrast, and not a comparison, which is here raised between the mother of Cain and the mother of Christ, and Perrone's whole argument, in consequence, tells not in his favour, but against him.

Yet this misnamed 'comparison' forms one of the chief arguments of Perrone for the affirmative of the question. As to his citations from the Fathers on the same side, it is useless to extract them at length. The strongest do but speak of the Blessed Virgin Mary as 'Virgo immaculata,' 'Domina intemerata,' and the like; what they do prove being a spotlessness *κατὰ τὴν παρθενίαν*, before and at the time of Christ's birth, which none but a Cerinthian or an Ebionite would think of denying; but as to any real authority for the Roman doctrine in either of its phases, we must say, with the pardon of Perrone, that they contain not the very slightest possible. As a specimen of the rest, we will transcribe those from SS. Ambrose, Augustine, and Ephrem of Syria.

I. S. Ambrose, towards the end of his commentary on the 118th Psalm (Eng. version 119), says,—'Suscipe me in carne quæ in Adam lapsa est, suscipe me non ex Sara sed ex Maria, ut incorrupta sit virgo, sed virgo per gratiam ab omni integra labe peccati.' Now a passage like this, to which no definite meaning at all can be given, is totally unfit for controversial use. But even, if it were, a few isolated words alone will not suffice to establish, certainly and without appeal, that S. Ambrose held an opinion so novel and, to say the least, so very different to that of the rest of the Church of his time and long after—(and there is, moreover, a doubtful reading in the passage, which throws a degree of uncertainty over the whole). It is to his system as a whole on sin and grace that we must look for his full and perfect opinion on the grand *principle* at issue. Now a more full acquaintance with the writings of the Bishop of Milan would have taught Perrone that he could not possibly, without plain self-contradiction, have intended anything more

by these words, at most, than an assertion such as S. Augustin (as we shall presently see) would not have denied, though he hesitated to confess it as plainly and directly, viz. that it was not absolutely impossible that the Blessed Virgin Mary might have been preserved from actual sin after her birth by special grace;—not that she was born, much less that she was conceived without original sin. Thus, throughout his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, he lays it down, 'repeatedly and emphatically, that the sin of Adam attaches to all his naturally-born children, without the possibility of exception. On chap. viii. ver. 14, 'I am carnal, sold under sin,' he says,—'This is to be sold under sin —to derive our origin from Adam, who first sinned, and by his own fault became subject to sin.' Again, on chap. viii. ver. 12: 'Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh to live after the flesh'—'Rectum et manifestum est, non nos adinventi Adæ qui carnaliter egit, obsecundare debere, qui prior peccans, mortem nobis hæreditatis titulo dereliquit.' On 1 Cor. xv. 22: 'As in Adam all die,' &c.—'Hoc dicit quia (sicut) Adam peccans mortem invenit, et omnes ex ejus origine tenuit, ut dissolvantur.' Lastly, in his book 'De Pœnitentia,' 'Christ also took our flesh, but the vices of it He took not; for He was not, as all we, born of the union of man and woman; but He was born of the Holy Ghost, and an immaculate virgin. For we all are born under sin, as we read in the Confession,—"I was shapen in iniquity,"' &c.

So when S. Hilary calls Christ's flesh '*caro peccati*,' '*carnem peccati recepit ut assumptione nostræ carnis delicta donaret, dum ejus fit particeps assumptione non crimine*,' (lib. de Trin. § 13,) no one supposes him to hold that Christ was not conceived *sine macula* of the Holy Ghost, and did not sanctify the nature which He took, but lay under sin: but we interpret a saying, however strong, on one side, by what we find on the other, always remembering, that scarcely any heresy ever yet arose but, being traced back to its first cause, it is found to have consisted in the exclusive urging of a relative truth, without due allowance being made for the counteracting force of its correlative,—the perfect system consisting of the fusion of the two into one.

II. The passage of S. Augustin to which we have referred above, is as follows:—To Pelagius, who had mentioned those saints from Abel to the Blessed Virgin Mary, who '*non modo non peccasse sed etiam juste vixisse referuntur*,' S. Augustin replies:—

'*Excepta itaque sancta virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quæstionem; unde enim scimus quid ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit, ad vincendum ex omni parte*

peccatum, quæ concipere ac parere meruit quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum?—Tom. x. p. 145.

But this passage is only concerned with the Virgin's freedom from *actual* sin, and not at all with her freedom from original: and it is very far from being a plain affirmative even of the former. And besides, S. Augustin's opinion on the subject has already been shown to be contrary to the doctrine of Perrone. The above work against Pelagius, indeed, seems to have been written three years later than the former; but unless it can be shown positively to contradict it, which is evidently impossible, all that can be proved from it is, that, as regards the Blessed Virgin Mary herself, S. Augustin 'nullo modo haberi voluit questionem.'

III. S. Ephrem's words are as follows:—'*Immaculata et incorrupta, incorrupta et prorsus pudica atque omni sorde ac labe peccati alienissima virgo, Dei sponsa et Domina nostra inviolata, integra planeque pura et casta Virgo, Dei genetrix, sanctior Seraphim et incomparabiliter reliquis omnibus supernis exercitibus gloriosior.*' When Perrone says of these words, in reference to his previous citations, '*proprius ad rem nostram spectant,*' we may leave the obvious conclusion to our readers; but when he proceeds to affirm, as he does, '*Hæc cum maculata Beatæ Virginis origine nullo componi modo possunt,*' we must be permitted to ask for what he has not given us—some proof, however slight, of that assertion, or how words, evidently expressing only a *personal* purity and dignity, can be taken truthfully to express a spotlessness of *nature*.

In fact, even the terms '*Sanctior Seraphim et incomparabiliter reliquis omnibus supernis exercitibus gloriosior,*' strong as they undoubtedly are, contain nothing more than may be found in the pages of the highest authorities of our own Church, and apply to the Blessed Virgin Mary only as one, however personally exalted or favoured, of the redeemed. Bishop Andrewes, for instance, in his first sermon on the Nativity, speaks quite as strongly of all Christians as such. '*Here then cometh the matter of admiration; they, spirits, glorious, heavenly, immortal, yet in no wise took He them, but the seed of Abraham—Angels and not men, so in reason it should be—men and not angels, so it is; . . . They every way, in everything else above and before us, in this beneath and behind us; and we before the angels, the Cherubim, the Seraphim, and all the principalities and thrones in this dignity.*'¹ And in his prayers he could say, at once, 'Making mention of the all-holy,

¹ Sermons, vol. i. p. 5. 1841. Oxford Edition. Ang. Cath. Library.

‘undefiled, and more than blessed Mary, mother of God, and ever virgin;’¹ and, also, ‘In Jesus salvation, in Christ anointing, in the only-begotten Son sonship, in the Lord and master’s treatment, in His conception and birth, the cleansing of our unclean conception and birth.’² To speak thus, is really to follow the voice of Holy Scripture and the Primitive Church.

To the above extracts of Perrone’s we will add a few of our own from the Fathers of the Church *before* S. Augustin, whose pages,—if they contain no direct assertions on a subject, which Cave, when speaking of a period far later than theirs, justly calls ‘*inauditum ante in Ecclesia dogma*;’—may at least enable us, indirectly and by implication, to form a judgment of what their decision would have been, could they have spoken directly on a doctrine, opposed in its first principle to that system which they held, of human redemption, themselves, and which they have delivered to us their successors. If it were indeed as Perrone represents it to be when he says, ‘It will be enough if the *res ipsa* be handed down from antiquity, and the seeds or germs, so to speak, of this opinion, be found in their works, which opinion became always more and more explained;’ our argument would have been a more difficult one: but because the contrary is so plainly the fact; because we not only do not find the germs or seeds of any such doctrine as his, in Scripture, in the early Church, in the writings of the most holy and learned of the Church of Rome herself, from the days of S. Bernard downwards,—but a system, at least in the two first, the very opposite to it, and which no ingenuity, subtlety, or learning, has ever been able to reconcile with it; therefore it is that we do not hesitate to say, that its being ruled by a single Pope as an article of faith necessary to salvation, would be a glaring insult to the voice of Scripture, and to that Church of the early Saints to which Perrone pretends to make appeal.

And, firstly, there is a certain, and not slight moral weight against Perrone, in the manner in which the early writers meet the opponents of their faith on the primary question of the Nature and Personality of our Lord; and their words do, as it appears to us, by anticipation, utterly quash and overthrow the doctrine for which Perrone is contending. They are all careful and scrupulous in laying it down, in which they surely follow the holy Apostles themselves, that He was God the Son, taking the nature of His own creature, man, of the Blessed Virgin Mary, by miraculous operation of the Holy Ghost, that so He might escape that ‘*contagio peccati*,’ which attaches to all the

¹ Prayers, 5th day, Intercession.

² Prayers, 4th day, Profession.

natural descendants of Adam, without exception, and which He expiated by His death on the cross; His sufferings thereon making, as S. Athanasius teaches us in his work, 'De Incarnatione Verbi,' an atonement not only as precious and complete as would have been made by the death of all men together, but infinitely more so, because they were those not of man only but of God Himself.

Had the early Gnostics known that it was an especial doctrine of Christianity, that His mother *also*, the naturally born daughter of mere human parents, was, from the first moment of her existence, exempt from all sin, what an advantage would it not have afforded them in their denial of His real and very manhood, and human flesh, and how prone they would have been to avail themselves of it! and how could S. Irenæus have so dwelt as he does on every point of His identity with us as the Son of Man, sin excepted in Him alone and in no one else, against the brood of Simon and Valentinus; or how could he have combated the idea, as he did, that the Son of a mother perfectly sinless, and therefore, as they might well have concluded, not really human, was not an incorporeal 'visus' as held by Saturninus, or a mere manifestation 'sub forma hominis,' as Marcion believed? 'Qui dicunt eum putative manifestum, neque in carne natum, atque vere hominem factum, adhuc sub veteri sunt damnatione, advocacionem præbentes peccato, non devicta secundum eos morte, quæ regnavit ab Adam usque ad Moysen etiam in eos qui non peccaverunt in similitudinem transgressionis Adæ.'—p. 248. Grabe. We might cite numberless passages from the works of this father and martyr, for the moral weight they contain, and the indication they give of the direction of his belief, 1, on the Universality, with One only exception, of sin both original and actual in all men; and 2, that Christ took human nature from Mary, not already purified, but to make it pure *by* taking it.

'We maintain,' says Tertullian, 'not that the flesh of sin is destroyed by Christ, but the sin of the flesh; not the matter, but the nature; not the substance, but the fault; as the Apostle says, "He destroyed sin in the flesh;" for he elsewhere says, that "Christ came in the likeness of sinful flesh;" not that He took this likeness of the flesh, as an image of the body and not in truth, but by this term, "the likeness of sinful flesh," he means that the flesh itself of Christ was not sinful, like his who first committed sin,—it was of the kind, not of the sin of Adam, for hence we prove that there was that flesh in Christ whose nature in man is sinful, and so in Him sin is done away, that having been in Christ without *sin which in man is not found without it*. "If then," you say, "Christ put on our flesh, it was sinful in Him,"—forbear to narrow the inexplicable meaning, for putting on our flesh, He made it His; and making it His, He made it sinless.'¹

¹ De Carne Christi, § xvi.

Tertullian, in this piece, is arguing against the Valentinians for 'the reasonable soul and human flesh of Christ,' and he is, from the nature of the case, opposing throughout any such doctrine as that of the Immaculate Conception of any but of Christ Himself alone. His words, 'making it His, He made it sinless,' contain precisely the same doctrine as that of S. Augustine in the work already cited against Julian, and of S. Athanasius, viz.: that Christ took our flesh, and by taking it—by His contact as the Creator with His own work—He sanctified it: communicating to it, as part of Himself, that holiness without measure, which neither the malice of Satan nor the disobedience of Adam, both creatures, could ever overcome, but which was infinitely and ineffably more powerful to renew than their sin had been to destroy. He sanctified human nature Himself directly, as its God, not through Mary previously. He received it of her unsanctified; and by making it His own, it must henceforth, as His, be perfectly holy—without spot or blemish. S. Athanasius, in his piece '*De Incarnatione*,' a piece which is, of its kind, perhaps the most valuable that we have after the writings of the Apostles, speaks as follows:—

'Nor when the Virgin brought Him forth, did she suffer; nor being in a body, was He defiled by it,—but He rather sanctified His body; for if even the sun which He made, and on which we look in its course in the heavens, is not defiled by its contact with the bodies that are on the earth, nor is put out by darkness, but rather itself enlightens and purifies all things; much more was the all-holy Word of God, the Creator and Lord of the sun, when revealing Himself in a body, free from defilement,—rather, being incorruptible, He both quickened and purified the body, which in itself was dead.'¹

The sinlessness then of human nature, according to S. Athanasius, came not from Mary, but from its hypostatical union with His Godhead.

S. Epiphanius has two most remarkable, and, we might almost say, prophetic pieces against the opposite heresies of the Antidicomarianitæ and the Collyridians; the former of whom sought to lower the Blessed Virgin Mary, as an object of especial Divine favour and privilege, to the level of other women; and the latter, by sacrifice and prayers directed especially and exclusively to her, to raise her above all other members of the human race, and, in fact, place her on a level with the Divinity Itself. If he herein condemn the low and unbecoming language on the Blessed Virgin Mary used at times by some among ourselves, whose accidental position forms their sole conceivable claim to the title of English Churchmen, he as little supports the doctrine held by authority in the Church of

¹ § xvii. p. 50, vol. i. pt. i. Padua 1777.

Rome. Having said that Scripture does not declare, nor he himself know 'whether she ever died, or did not die, and were buried or were not buried,' he produces, on the one side, the prophecy of Simeon, Luke ii. 35, and, on the other, Rev. xii. 13, 14,¹ which, he says, may very well have been fulfilled of her; and he concludes:—

Ἦτοι γὰρ ἀπέθανεν ἡ ἀγία παρθένος καὶ τέθαπται, ἐν τιμῇ αὐτῆς ἡ κοίμησις, καὶ ἐν ἀγνεΐᾳ ἡ τελευτὴ, καὶ ἐν παρθενίᾳ ὁ στέφανος. Ἦτοι ἀνηρέθη, καθὼς γέγραπται, Καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῆς διελύσεται ῥομφαία, ἐν μάρτυσιν αὐτῆς τὸ κλέος. καὶ ἐν μακαρίσμοις τὸ αὐτῆς ἅγιον σῶμα δι' ἧς φῶς ἀνέτειλε τῷ κόσμῳ, ἦτοι δὲ ἔμεινε, καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀδυνατεῖ τῷ Θεῷ πάντα ποιεῖν ὥσαπερ βούλεται, τὸ τέλος γὰρ αὐτῆς οὐδεὶς ἔγνω—πέρα τοῦ δέοντος οὐ χρὴ τιμᾶν τοὺς ἁγίους, ἀλλὰ τιμᾶν τὸν δεσπότην αὐτῶν. πανσάσθω τοῖνυν ἡ πλάνη τῶν πεπλανημένων, οὔτε γὰρ Θεὸς ἡ Μαρία, οὔτε ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἔχουσα τὸ σῶμα.—§ xxiii. p. 1055.

He adds, in his next treatise,—that against the Collyridians :

'The body of the Holy Virgin was indeed holy, but she was not God, nor given to us, *eis προσκύνησιν*, but she herself worshipped Him who was born of her flesh. This the Gospel assures us of, relating how our Lord himself said to her, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" Lest any should think her to have been of a higher nature, he called her "woman," as foreshowing that there should be heresies and schisms, and that no one, through too much awe of her, might fall into the folly—*ληρολόγημα*—of this heresy . . . She was indeed a chosen vessel, but was still a woman, and in nothing different in nature to others, though honoured as the saints . . . as Elias, as S. John whom Christ loved, as Thecla; than whom, however, Mary is far more to be honoured, for the economy of which she was thought worthy; but neither Elias, nor John, nor any of the saints, may be worshipped . . . and if we are forbidden to worship even angels, how much more so to worship Mary, who was indeed given to Joachim and Anna, δι' εὐχῆς καὶ ἐπιμελείας, but who was born in no manner παρά τὴν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν.—§ iv. p. 1061.

We are continually taught by the early Church, and in the most high and glowing language, of the Graces which have accrued to men from Christ's Humanity; as when S. Clement of Alexandria says that Christ, through His heavenly doctrine, *θεοποιεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον*. And S. Athanasius, to Maximus, and elsewhere: *Οὐκ ἀνθρώπου τέ τινος μετέχοντες σώματος, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου σῶμα λαμβάνοντες, θεοποιούμεθα.*² And S. Epiphanius, on the Transfiguration :

Ἡ σὰρξ, ἡ ἀπὸ Μαρίας οὔσα, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους τυγχάνουσα . . . μετεμορφούτο εἰς δόξαν, δόξαν ἐπικτωμένη τῆς θεότητος, τὴν τιμὴν τε καὶ τὴν δόξαν, καὶ δόξαν τὴν ἐπουράνιον ἣν μὴ εἶχεν ἡ σὰρξ ἀπαρχῆς, ἐνταῦθα δὲ λαβοῦσα ἐν τῇ συνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον.³—*Her.* 69, p. 805. D. § 78.

¹ Ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰ δοκοῦσι τινες ἐσφάλλαι, ζητησῶσι τὰ ἰχνη τῶν γράφων καὶ εὖρουν ἀν' οὗτε θάνατον Μαρίας, οὔτε εἰ τέθηκεν οὔτε εἰ μὴ τέθηκεν, οὔτε εἰ τέθαπται οὔτε εἰ μὴ τέθαπται.—Vol. i. p. 1043.

² To Maximinus, vol. i. part ii. p. 734, § 2; and see his first letter to Serapion, § 24:—'Through the Holy Ghost we are partakers of the Divine Nature and they in whom He is, *θεοποιούνται*.'

³ Contra Arianos, I. § 69. p. 805. D.

And S. Basil :—

‘*Ἡ πρὸς Θεὸν ὁμοίωσις καὶ τὸ ἀκρότατον τῶν ὀρεκτῶν Θεὸν γενέσθαι.*—*De Spiritu Sancto*, vol. iii. pt. i. chap. ix. § 23. p. 27.

And S. Cyprian, ‘*De Idolorum vanitate*’ :—

‘*Hic est virtus Dei, hic ratio, hic sapientia ejus et gloria. Hic in Virginem delabatur, carnem Spiritus Sancti induitur, Deus cum homine miscetur. Hic Deus noster, hic Christus est, qui mediator duorum, hominem induit quem perducatur ad Patrem. Quod homo est esse Christus voluit, ut et homo possit esse quod Christus est.*’—*Routh. Opusc. i. p. 275.*

In whatever sense this class of assertions, meeting us as it does in every page of the writings of the early fathers, is to be taken, that is, how far, according to the strict meaning of the letter, or with a necessary saving understood of the integrity of the Divine Nature in itself,—we cannot but think that the peculiar grace which is here mentioned, is in danger of being taken by the Church of Rome from the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, to be attributed to His Mother the Blessed Virgin Mary instead, in support of which opinion we will merely cite one passage from Bishop Jeremy Taylor’s ‘*Dissuasive*’ :—

‘*It is no wonder that Pope Leo IV. calls her a Goddess, and Turcelin the Jesuit, “Divinæ Majestatis Potestatisque sociam. Huic olim cœlestium mortaliumque principatum detulit, ad hujus arbitrium (quod hominum tutela postulat,) terras, Maria, cœlum, naturamque moderatur. Hac annuente, et per hanc, divinos thesauros et cœlestia dona largitur.” Nay, in the mass books penned in 1538, and used in the Polonian churches, they call the Blessed Virgin Mary “viam ad vitam totius mundi gubernatricem, peccatorum cum Deo reconciliatricem, fontem remissionis peccatorum, lumen luminum,” and at last salute her with an “Ave Universæ Trinitatis Mater.”*’

These expressions, Bishop Taylor assures us, are not picked out as the most singular; and he proceeds to refer to the Council of Constance, ‘*which did invoke the Blessed Virgin Mary in the same manner as Councils did use to invoke the Holy Ghost; they call her “the Mother of Grace, the remedy to the miserable, the fountain of mercy, and the light of the Church,” attributes proper to God and incommunicable; and he mentions the Psalter of our Lady “of great and ancient account in the Church of Rome,” said to have been compiled by S. Bonaventure, and “consisting of the Psalms of David, in which the name of Lord is left out, and that of Lady put in, so that whatever David said of God and Christ, the same prayers and the same praises they say of the Blessed Virgin Mary.”*’¹ This Psalter is found in the sixth volume of Bonaventure’s works.

Perrone, then, has so far brought no real support whatever for

¹ Oxford, 1836, p. 102.

his doctrine. There is no trace of it in the pages of Scripture; the fathers of the Church of Africa did not hold it, as is shown by Tertullian, Ferrand, and S. Augustine; it was not received by the Church of Alexandria, since her greatest champion, S. Athanasius, holds another system, and one which is in fact antagonistic to it. S. Ephrem shows that it was equally unknown to the East; and S. Ambrose's writings prove that it must look for its support elsewhere than to the West.

From the early fathers Perrone passes on to the Liturgies, which, if we do not mistake, will be found as little on his side as the other authorities to which he has appealed. 'No one,' he says, 'is ignorant that the authority of Liturgies is most extensive, inasmuch as they contain the testimony, not of one doctor or another, but of entire Churches, and they are therefore of more weight in proportion as the Church itself is of greater note, and the Liturgy more eminent for its antiquity.' We willingly admit a statement of so much force in itself, and so decisive on one side of the question or other. It might, indeed, have been expected, after so confident an assertion, that its author would have given us copious extracts from all or most of the primitive Liturgies of value to prove that, whatever may be the opinions of private doctors, the Churches themselves did hold the doctrine for which he is contending. But four brief extracts from the Liturgies of S. James, the Syrian Maronites, the Alexandrian version of S. Basil, and S. Mark, form the whole of his authorities of this class, and even these, like his Patristic citations, are to be understood, beyond a doubt, of the personal spotlessness of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of nothing else.¹

Perrone, however, has done better for his cause in withholding, than he could have done in producing the testimony of these monuments of antiquity. We shall now endeavour in some measure to supply his deficiency, and show to which side of the question their evidence does in truth preponderate.

¹ These citations are as follows:—'*Commemorantes sanctissimam, immaculatam, gloriosissimam Dominam nostram, matrem Dei et semper Virginem Mariam.*'—'*Commemorationem agamus sanctissimæ, immaculatæ, gloriosissimæ, benedictæ Domine nostre, Matris Dei et semper virginis Mariæ;*' item, '*præcipue, sanctissimæ, immaculatæ.*'—'In ritu pariter,' he says in continuation, '*ordinationis Chorepiscopi, qui apud Syros Maronitas obtinet, quemque ex vetusto codice vulgavit Morinus, legitur "Omnes pro eo oremus sanctam, et laudatam, et immaculatam Dominam nostram, beatam omni tempore Mariam, genetricem Dei, commemorantes."* Sic etiam in liturgia S. Basilii Alexandrina legitur "*Præcipue vero sanctissimæ, gloriosissimæ, immaculatæ, benedictionibus cumulatæ, Domine nostræ Deiparæ, et semper Virginis Mariæ,*" necnon in liturgia S. Marci, "*In primis sanctissimæ, intemeratæ,*" &c. . . . atque ita passim multa leguntur quæ omnimodam Beatæ Virginis a quavis labe immunitatem perspicue commendant.'—P. 106.

There was, according to Mr. Palmer, originally one chief type of Liturgy common to all the Churches of the East, but subsequently branching off into three separate divisions, which bore the names respectively of S. James, S. Mark, and S. Basil. The last of these, as Mr. Palmer shows, is much older than the Saint whose name it bears, having been added to and improved, rather than originally framed by him; it is moreover the groundwork of the Liturgies of S. Gregory Nazianzen and S. Chrysostom, and it was used in the Churches of Constantinople; in Asia; in Egypt; and Mr. Palmer even says that there are vivid traces of it as used at Antioch in the second century.¹

‘When I reflect on the vast extent of these countries,’ says this eminent ritualist, ‘the independence of the Churches which existed there, the power which each Bishop had of improving his Liturgy, the circumstantial varieties which we find between the Liturgies of these Churches, and yet the substantial identity of all, it seems to me difficult if not impossible to account for this identity and uniformity in any other manner than by supposing that the Apostles themselves had originated the Oriental Liturgy, and communicated it to all the Churches at their very foundation. The uniformity between these Liturgies, as extant in the fourth or fifth centuries, is such as bespeaks a common origin. Their diversity is such as to prove the remoteness of the period at which they were originated. To what remote period can we refer as exhibiting a perfect general uniformity of Liturgy except to the Apostolic age?’—Vol. i. p. 80.

The question is, then, what evidence, if any, do these works, so ancient, so extensive, and so august, afford for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception? But first for the Liturgies themselves. That of S. James was used by the churches that afterwards formed the Patriarchate of Antioch, (*Palmer*, i. p. 44,) and, if not actually the composition of the first Bishop of Jerusalem himself, it is at least to be traced to the very earliest ages, (*Ibid.* sect. i. p. 43.) We have it in the orthodox Greek version, and in the Latin of two Syriac versions, given by Renaudot in his second volume. In the former, according to Mr. Neale’s translation of the text of Asseman, the priest, after he has made mention of the departed saints, patriarchs, prophets, and others, continues—

‘Especially the most holy, spotless, excellently laudable, glorious Lady, the Mother of God and ever-Virgin Mary.’

To which the Choir replies:—

‘It is very meet to bless thee the Mother of God, the ever-blessed, the entirely spotless; more honourable than the Cherubim and infinitely more glorious than the Seraphim; thee who didst bear without corruption, God the Word; thee, verily the Mother of God, we magnify. In thee, O full of grace, all creation exults, and the race of men; in thee, *sanctified temple*, spiritual paradise, glory of Virgins, of whom God took flesh, our God that was before the world, became a child; For He made thy womb His throne,

¹ Vol. i. p. 72.

and rendered it more extended than the Heavens; In thee, O full of grace, all creation exults; glory to thee.'¹—*History of the Holy Eastern Church*, vol. ii. p. 603.

S. Mark's Liturgy is, in the opinion of Mr. Palmer, though not of Renaudot, that of the primitive Church of Alexandria, and it is said to have been perfected by S. Cyril. Having also commemorated the Patriarchs, Apostles, &c., it proceeds briefly as follows :—

Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας, ἀχράντου, εὐλογημένης, δεσποίνης ἡμῶν, θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.—*Ren.* vol. i. p. 135.

The Liturgy of S. Basil is extant in the Greek version of Constantinople, in Mr. Palmer's opinion the original of all; and of Alexandria, which is altered from it; in the Syriac, Coptic, and Arabic, which are all, more or less, translations of the Greek of Alexandria, and in use among the Monophysites of Egypt. Of these, in the Greek of Renaudot, we find almost the same words, on this subject, as in that of S. Mark :—

Μνησθῆναι καταξίωσον Κύριε καὶ τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος εὐαρεστησάντων σοὶ ἁγίων πατέρων πατριαρχῶν . . . Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας, ὑπερενδόξου, ἀχράντου, ὑπερευλογημένης, δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.—*Tom.* i. p. 70.

In like manner, and in almost the same words, in S. Gregory Nazianzen's Liturgy, (which, as we have said, is built chiefly upon S. Basil's,) we read in the Greek version—

Μνησθητι Κύριε . . . Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας, ὑπερενδόξου, ἀχράντου, ὑπερευλογημένης, δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.—*Ren.* i. p. 103.

Further on, indeed, there is mention of an immaculate body, but it is Christ's, and not the Blessed Virgin Mary's :

Ὁ ἄνω τῷ Πατρὶ συγκαθήμενος, καὶ ὧδε ἡμῖν ἀοράτως σὺνών, καὶ καταξίωσον τῇ κραταίᾳ σου χεὶρ, μεταδοῦναι ἡμῖν τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματός σου καὶ δι' ἡμῶν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ.

And this is in accordance with a like expression in the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom : 'Joseph, ὁ εὐσχήμων, who took down from the cross τὸ ἄχραντόν σου σώμα.' (Erasmus's version, p. 536.) The last-mentioned Liturgy affords two instances of the use of language similar to the above :—

Τῆς παναγίας, ἀχράντου, ὑπερευλογημένης. ἐνδόξου, δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων μνημονεύσαντες.—*Tom.* iv. p. 525.

¹ Mr. Neale observes that the paragraph immediately preceding these words, and which contains the angelic salutation, 'is clearly an interpolation, as interrupting the sequence of the prayer.' He is perfectly right in this assertion, although the address in question is not peculiar to this particular Liturgy, for in the longer Syriac of Renaudot, which is much older than Asseman's Greek version, it is not found. And see Palmer, vol. i. p. 95.

Again,—

Τῇ πρεσβείᾳ τῆς ἀχράντου δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, ἀκατακρίτως με ἀξίωσον δέξασθαι τὴν ἀχραντον σοῦ δωρεὰν εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. κ.τ.λ.—P. 544.

Thus much for the chief of the orthodox Liturgies of the East. Besides these there are others of a certain weight, from their antiquity and substantial contents, but of less authority than the above, both as being translations instead of originals, and as being used by bodies more or less heretical. Two Syriac versions of the Liturgy of S. James are given by Renaudot, of the longer of which—used by the Monophysites, and translated and altered from the Greek—he says that ‘although undoubtedly, as the ‘Syrians themselves confess, a translation from the Greek, yet, ‘if not positively the most ancient of all the Syriac liturgies, it ‘is undoubtedly their *fundus et exemplar*,’ (Tom. i. p. 81;) it contains a commemoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in terms very closely resembling those above: ‘Iterum atque iterum ‘commemoramus vere beatam laudatamque ab omnibus generationibus terræ, sanctam, benedictam, semper Virginem, generatricem Dei, Mariam; simulque agamus memoriam Prophetarum, ‘Apostolorum,’ &c. The shorter, used by the Syro-Jacobites, (Neale) merely mentions her, in general terms, as ‘Genetrix Dei.’

The Coptic of S. Basil, S. Gregory Nazianzen, and S. Cyril of Alexandria, in use among the Monophysites of Egypt, bear, as would be expected, like the Greek, a general resemblance to each other on the question at issue. The first concludes the Commemoration of the Saints with the words, ‘Præcipue vero ‘et maxime sanctæ et gloriæ plenæ, semper Virginis, genetricis ‘Dei, Divæ Sanctæ Mariæ.’¹ And in the other two, it is sufficient to say that there is scarcely a shadow of variation; and therefore when Perrone asserts, as he does, (pp. 106, 107,) that the festival of the Conception was celebrated by the Greeks and Easterns, from the most remote period, he has nothing more to urge in proof of it than a few words of the Typicum of S. Sabæus (A.D. 484), and of S. Andrew of Crete (A.D. 636), which speak of the conception of Mary, but in no manner as if it were immaculate: ‘Tuam hodie, religiosa Anna, celebramus conceptionem, quod, ‘absoluta sterilitatis vinculis, eam utero conceperis quæ Eum ‘potuit capere qui nusquam capi possit.’² ‘Nihil post sacras ‘litteras,’ says Renaudot, ‘potiorem inter Christianos auctorita-

¹ Renaudot, vol. i. p. 17.

² Cave tells us that Sabæus wrote a ‘Typicum,’ or order of reciting the office of the Church throughout the whole year, for the use of his monastery; it embraced fifty-nine chapters, and soon obtained in all the monasteries of Jerusalem.—Hist. Litt. I. 457.

‘tem habuit, quam publica Ecclesiarum monumenta, quæ vocem illarum representant, et eorum nomine loquuntur quodammodo. Habebant preces illæ auctores suos, qui tamen ignorabantur, neque ex eorum nomine, sed in usu Ecclesiæ quæ preces illas sacrificio quotidiano consecraverat pondus earum testimoniis accedebat.’ (Vol. i. p. 156.) ‘A certain form of Liturgy, says Mr. Palmer, ‘prevailed in the fourth century, from Arabia to Cappadocia, and from the Mediterranean Sea to the other side of the Euphrates; and . . . this can be traced nearly up to the Apostolic age. . . . The same form of Liturgy prevailed . . . through the greater part of Asia Minor. The same form is used in Thrace, and it seems to have existed there and in Macedonia and in Greece, from time immemorial.’¹ Something of the language of this great and wide-spread witness of primitive truth we have now seen. Its words, indeed, in different Churches, are varied—its Marian doctrine is one. She is addressed by every term honourable to herself personally; she is placed at the head of all the Saints; her glories, as the Mother of God incarnate, are abundantly celebrated. Perrone himself, with Petavius, confesses that from the titles conferred on her,—‘intemerata, immaculata,’ &c.—no invincible argument for his doctrine can be deduced; and Renaudot, without suspicion, admits that ‘no one can accuse the Easterns of being deficient in the honours which are due to the Deipara, and that many may, not without reason, assert that in her worship they, in some degree, pass into excess and proceed to superstition.’ But amidst all their veneration for her, excessive as it was, of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception we find not a trace. More than this, the really Catholic verities of the *θεοτοκία* and *ἀειπαρθένεια* meet us at every turn—is it probable, or even possible, that had these Churches held the former, as either Perrone or the Mediævalists hold it, they should have united, one and all, in suppressing what would be her great and crowning grace—and that alone—copious, and in fact almost over-abundant as they are in the expression of their feelings towards her in every other respect? It is plain that such was not the belief of the framers of the Eastern Liturgies, or of the Churches and sects which used them; and that from their so constantly classing the Blessed Virgin Mary with the Patriarchs, Prophets, and others, and with only the difference of an *ἐξαιρέτως*, or a ‘maxime,’ for her personal rank, they knew of no such essential superiority on her part as the novel doctrines of the Immaculate Conception would bestow on her.

And for the Liturgies of the West, to which Perrone has not

¹ Antiquities, vol. i. p. 80.

alluded, the language of the ancient form of S. Gregory the Great is precisely the same on this subject as that of those of the East, from which we have now cited 'Communicantes et memoriam tenentes in primis gloriosæ semper Virginis Mariæ, Genetricis Dei, et Domini nostri Jesu Christi.' The doctrine of 'Sanctificatio in utero' was held by Sixtus IV., and the festival to correspond owes its institution in the Church of Rome to him. His introduction into the Breviary of the Office of Leonard Nogueroles, and its subsequent ejection by Pius V. we have already mentioned: with the substitution by the latter Pope of the Office of the Festival of the Nativity for that of the Conception, with the change merely of the term 'Nativitas' into 'Conceptio' (but without the addition of 'immaculata' to the latter), in which he is said to have followed the example of S. Anselm. This order has since continued, and the expressions of the Breviary and Missal now stand as follows: 'Conceptio est hodie Sanctæ Mariæ,' 'Conceptionem Sanctæ Mariæ celebremus,' 'Conceptio tua Dei genetrix, virgo, gaudium annuntiavit universo mundo,' &c. Gregory XV. however gave permission to some of the Gallican Churches, as late as the years 1834 and 1843, to add the term 'Immaculata' to the ancient preface, 'Et te in Conceptione tua;' thereby setting his seal to that departure from the Mediæval type of doctrine which had lately begun to take place, by tacitly substituting an Immaculate Conception, strictly and properly so called, for the former one, which taught that the Blessed Virgin Mary was made immaculate by Grace, *after* Conception.

The next point that we have to consider is the body of evidence contained in the pages of those eminent Mediævalists, to whom we have already made allusion, as supporting the doctrine of S. Bernard, and therefore, in fact, rejecting that of Perrone; and to these we will adduce, as at once the natural sequence and conclusion of the whole question, the bulls and other documents which, as we have said, the different Popes were from time to time compelled to issue, with the view of either advancing or retarding the progress of the doctrine as the circumstances of the case and the temporary quiet of the Church demanded.

Next to S. Bernard, whose words have already been given at length, is, as we have said, Peter Lombard, the far-famed Master of the sentences, and Bishop of Paris in the middle of the twelfth century. In his third book of the sentences, Distinction 3, 'On the Flesh which the Word of God took.' 'Of what nature was it before He took it, and when it was taken?' in

¹ Op. S. Greg. Paris, 1705, vol. iii. pt. i. p. 3.

² P. 373; and note 1, p. 374.

answer to the question, 'Whether it was bound to sin,' (*obligata peccato*), 'and if it were assumed as such by Him,' he replies—

'It may, indeed, be said and believed, according to the attestations of the Saints, that it was previously obnoxious to sin, as the other flesh of the Virgin; but by the operation of the Holy Spirit, it was so cleansed that it was united to the Word, free from all sin,—the punishment only remaining—and that not by necessity, but by the free will of Him who assumed it. The Holy Ghost coming into Mary cleansed her from all sin, and even freed her from all incentive to sin, either by entirely destroying it, as some think, or by so weakening it and marring its power, that no occasion of sin existed in her thereafter.'

He cites and follows S. Augustin (whose words scarcely bear him out,¹) in saying that—

'To the Blessed Virgin Mary a greater share of grace was given to conquer sin "*ex omni parte*,"—for the Word assumed a flesh, he continues, "*peccatrici similem in pœna non in culpa*," and therefore was not a sinner. But all other flesh of man is the flesh of sin. His alone is not so, because His mother conceived Him not in concupiscence but in grace. He came then, and in an immaculate body, because He was conceived without concupiscence.'

It is plain that even if, like S. Bernard, he incline to exceed the manner in which the early fathers speak of the Sanctity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, yet from following S. Augustin, as he does, his words, according to the canons of criticism, ought to be interpreted as applying to her personal spotlessness, and to that only; at any rate he is as far as possible from holding the doctrine of Perrone.

'The four books of the Sentences,' says Mosheim, 'were not 'only received with universal applause, but acquired also such 'a high degree of authority as induced the most learned doctors 'in all places to employ their labours in illustrating and expounding them.' In fact this great work, through the commentaries which it called into existence, may be said to have directed the mind of the Church of Rome from the end of the twelfth century to the Council of Trent. One of the first, both in time and note, among the followers of Lombard, was our own countryman, S. Alexander of Hales, in Gloucestershire, known as the Irrefragable Doctor, and the master of S. Bonaventure. In his '*Summa Theologiæ*,' which Dupin proves to be the same as his work on the Sentences, at Number 2, article 2, he asks, 'Whether the Blessed Virgin Mary was sanctified, 1, *ante conceptionem*; or, 2, *in conceptione*; or, 3, *post conceptionem*?'

¹ 'Excepta sancta Virgine Maria, de qua, propter honorem Dei, nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, volo questionem. Inde enim scimus quod ei plus sit gratiæ collatum ad vincendum ex omni parte peccatum, quod concipere ac parere meruit quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum. Hac ergo excepta virgine, si omnes sancti et sanctæ congregari possint, et quæreretur ab eis an peccatum haberent, quid responderetur, nisi quod Joannes ait, cap. i. "Si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seduxerimus."—De Nat. et Grat. cap. 26.'

To the first question he replies decidedly in the negative; first, from the words of S. Paul to the Ephesians, chap. ii. ver. 3: 'We all had our conversation, in times past, in the lusts of our flesh,' &c.; and secondly from the authority of S. Bernard: and he argues, 'that as sanctification is twofold, of the Nature and of the Person, even if her parents had been sanctified personally they could not have been so, as to their nature; and that as she proceeded from the latter, which was not sanctified, she could not have been sanctified; and that although marriage in itself is lawful, and even meritorious, yet its issue cannot be holy, for S. Bernard's reason, "*Quomodo peccatum non fuit, ubi libido non defuit?*"—and therefore she could not have been immaculate in her conception.' To the last question he makes the same reply as S. Bernard, and from the same cases of Jeremiah and S. John the Baptist. 'But what was granted to them was not denied to her, and if they were sanctified *in utero*, much more so was the Blessed Virgin Mary.'

To Alexander of Hales succeeds his pupil, S. Bonaventure, 'the great light and ornament of the holy S. Francis,' as Butler terms him. He also, in his work on the Books of the Sentences, asks the same question and establishes the same conclusion as S. Alexander had done—though by a different course of reasoning—following the conclusion of S. Bernard, as opposed to that of Perrone. He holds that the Blessed Virgin Mary is not to be thought to have been sanctified before her animation, because Sanctification comes by grace, and applies to the soul and not to the body. The day of her Conception, he says, is certain, the time of her Sanctification uncertain; and therefore though the former, as that of a maculate body, should not be observed, yet the Sanctification may be celebrated; and he compares the Blessed Virgin Mary, after her sanctification, to the son of a king, 'who, having been born lame and afterwards cured, should rather be congratulated on his nativity than condoled on his affliction.' He admits that, from the propriety of the case, as the Mother of Jesus Christ and the greatest of the Saints, it may be said that she ought to have been conceived without sin; but he concludes that as S. Paul says, 'As in Adam all die,' and no one has need of redemption who is not under sin, and S. Augustin, when he says, as we have seen, that when speaking of the Blessed Virgin Mary he wishes to entertain no question about sin—(an assertion on which the maintainers of the Immaculate Conception greatly rely)—refers to actual and not to original sin,—it cannot truly be said that she was *conceived* immaculate. Though as the Church, which cannot err, celebrates her Nativity, he concludes that she was *born* holy, and therefore, that, having been under sin at her actual Conception, she was

sanctified 'in utero' before her birth—though the exact period of her Sanctification is altogether unknown.

Albertus Magnus, the master of S. Thomas Aquinas, argues that if the Blessed Virgin Mary had not been obnoxious to sin, and had therefore been herself the medicine of salvation, there would have been no need of any other saviour, and Christ's Incarnation would therefore have been superfluous. And again, that in the Church there are but two classes, the Head and the members—the former redeeming, the latter redeemed; and that the Blessed Virgin Mary not being the former, but one of the latter, she must have *received* Redemption, and therefore have lain under sin: and he gives two chief reasons why she could not have been sanctified in her parents: 1st, that the Grace of Sanctification does not come from them; and, 2dly, that as S. Bernard says, sin could not have been absent from their union.

He next tells us that the doctrine 'of a Sanctificatio ante animationem' is condemned by all the Paris Doctors (although Perrone is contending for something still higher—an absolute 'Sanctitas'), and that S. Augustin affirms, 'Omnis homo fuit Adam in naturâ præter Christum;' and he concludes, like the others, that she was sanctified after her 'animatio,' though it is not known *how long* after. But in this conclusion he has against him the words of S. Augustin, which he cites, but does not attempt to explain—'That which is not born cannot be reborn. The Grace of Sanctification confers new birth, and therefore cannot be given except to those already born.'¹

S. Thomas Aquinas himself, however, is stronger against the modern Romish doctrine than any other of his age. In his comment on the second book of the 'Sentences,' dist. 31, quest. 1, art. 2, 'Whether it is necessary that *all* men should be born in original sin?' he says, 'It is necessary that all men who are naturally born of Adam should have original sin, for if not, the defect in his nature, caused by sin, and from which all his posterity derive their original want of righteousness, must have been perfectly healed; which is not the case, and, therefore, all who are naturally descended from him, must be born in original sin.'

In his third book, dist. 3, quest. 1, he passes on to the particular question, 'Whether the Blessed Virgin Mary received Sanctification yet being 'in utero?'' and he also decides it in the affirmative, chiefly because, as he says, 'the Church does not solemnize that which is not holy;'² and he concludes, that

¹ Third book of 'Sentences,' dist. 3, art. 3, vol. xv. p. 25, &c. Lyons: 1651.

² The value of this argument, so much insisted on by the Seraphic Doctor and others of his time, is greatly affected by the facts that the festival of the Nativity has not absolute Apostolic authority, whilst that of the Conception was not heard

although such Sanctification is not expressly read in Holy Scripture, either in the Old or New Testament, yet it can certainly be gathered from what is found there; for 'if S. John and Jeremiah, who foretold Christ, were sanctified, much more so was the Blessed Virgin Mary who bore Him.'

Again, in the third part of his '*Summa Theologiæ*,' quest. 27, art. 1, 'Whether the Blessed Virgin Mary were sanctified before her Nativity?' he says, 'As sanctification comes of grace, and the Nativity of nature, she was not sanctified before her birth as to the latter, though, like Jeremiah and S. John, she were cleansed from any *personal* stain.' And he expressly disallows any Sanctification before her '*animatio*,' such as that for which Perrone contends,—first, because she was not then 'perfecta,' wanting a soul; and secondly, because, in this case, she would have had no need of Christ's Redemption. And he concludes, that although the Church of Rome herself does not celebrate the festival of the Immaculate Conception, she tolerates its observance in other Churches; and, therefore, that the '*celebritas*' is not to be entirely reprobated. 'Nor do we understand,' he says, 'by the festival, that she was "*sancta*" in her Conception, but that, since it is not known at what time she was sanctified, it is her Sanctification rather than her Conception that is observed on the day dedicated to the latter:' and finally, 'although her parents were sanctified and cleansed from original sin "*quoad personas*," they were not so "*quoad naturam*," and therefore that she herself at first lay under its bonds, as having been conceived "*secundum concupiscentiam parentum*;" and he is, as Gonzalez admits, 'most especially careful that whatever grace or beneficium there was, should be confessed to have been bestowed on herself alone, not on her parents, and not on her own soul "*ante animationem et constitutionem personæ*," lest a great principle of faith be destroyed, and a person set up, who, "*in se personaliter, seu ratione suæ personæ*," had no need of Redemption; but, to this end, some "*debitum*" or "*periculum*" must be laid down, "*a quo, si non teneretur, non liberaretur*,"—as Gonzalez himself confesses when he says, '*Assertores piæ sententiæ communiter*

of before the twelfth century, nor formally instituted until the time of Sixtus IV., 300 years afterwards. Gonzalez says, that if Pius V. did at all derogate from the truth of the '*piæ sententiæ*' by removing from the Breviary the office of Nogueirole—which, by the way, was done by a formal bull—he might have done so as a private Doctor merely, and not necessarily *ex cathedra*, as head of the Church. Why then may not the same licence of opinion be conceded to those, on the other hand, who venture to doubt whether the Popes have a power which the Apostles distinctly declare that themselves had not,—viz. that of deciding a thing to be or not to be at their own assertion, and, in fact, of creating articles of faith, instead of merely declaring and handing down what they have received?

'affirmant Beatam Virginem non solum habuisse debitum contra-
'hendi maculam originalem, cum fuit in lumbis parentum,
'atque in prima sui conceptione, *sed etiam in ipso primo instanti*
'*animationis.*'—P. 118.

Our readers will not require us to discuss the subtleties contained in the section of his work, which Gonzalez heads with the words, 'How is S. Thomas to be understood, when he repeats 'so often that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived in original 'sin?' but in which he neither overthrows the force of S. Thomas' plain words, nor attempts to show (as he must do if he would have his words carry the least weight) that the voice of all history from his own day, and the unsuspecting admissions of the Doctors of his own Church,—both of which so uniformly agree in ascribing to him the foremost place in the maintenance of the ancient doctrine,—are alike entirely mistaken.

In the fourteenth century, J. D. Scotus has been claimed by both sides of the question. We have already alluded to the disputation which he is said, by more than one of the Church historians, and our own Cave among the number, to have held before the University of Paris, and by which he induced that body not only to change the opinion which it had previously held to the contrary effect, but also to issue a decree, forcing their newly adopted one on all their members. But this whole account is undoubtedly erroneous, as Alexander Natalis shows, 'first, because no author, who was contemporary with Scotus, 'makes any mention of it whatever; secondly, there is no 'account of it among the Gallican historians, or of the pope who 'directed it to be held; thirdly, the names of Scotus' opponents 'are wholly unknown; fourthly, there is no record of it in the 'archives of Paris; and lastly, the decree was not made till the 'year 1497, 58 years after the Council of Basle, and 189 years 'after the death of Scotus, which took place in 1308.' To which we may add the fact, that Scotus' own doctrine is by no means such as to justify the historians in classing him, as they have done, among the opponents of those writers of the thirteenth century, from whose works we have just made citation.

¹ 'Ego diligenter evolvi,' says Gonzalez, 'scripta D. Thomæ, in quibus de hac controversia agit, et censeo præcipuum scopum Sancti Doctoris fuisse, probare Beatam Virginem in propria persona—id est quando incepit existere—in primo instanti animationis, indiguisset Redemptione, ac proinde contagium peccati originalis illam aliquo pacto affluisse, et, pro illo primo signo animationis, dici conceptam in peccato; quia caro ejus, genita per commixtionem maris et foeminae, erat infecta, et traxit secum vitium naturæ, ac proinde reddidit Beatam Virginem vere obnoxiam et subjectam maculae formali, consistenti in privatione gratiæ debitæ. Et sic Beata Virgo vere habuit in primo instanti fomitem habitalem peccati, seu concupiscentiam habitalem, in qua, secundum D. Thomam, consistit peccatum originale, pro materiali.'—P. 117.

² Vol. xxx. § 9. p. 585, &c.

On the question whether the Blessed Virgin Mary were conceived in original sin, he cites, among other authorities, the words of S. John the Baptist, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world' (John i. 29); on which he says, 'He only is innocent who comes not "*per propagationem*,"'—and St. Leo, de Nativitate Dei, 'He found none free from "*reatus*,"'—He came to free all, and the Blessed Virgin Mary among them,—and S. Bernard. He admits that it may be said that Christ came to open the door to *all*, and to free *all* from sin, and that if the Blessed Virgin Mary had not had original sin, she would not have needed that act of Grace; and that, as she was born naturally, '*in coitu*,' she was infected with sin—that she endured the sufferings of hunger, thirst, and many other trials, which were laid on her through sin, and not voluntarily assumed by her, as she was not our '*redemptrix et mediatrix*,' but were inflicted on her by God, and not unjustly, and, therefore, that she was not innocent. Against this he can only suggest, that from the perfection of her Son, in that He was our Redeemer, &c., she herself, as His mother, could have had no sin.

He says, indeed, that S. Bernard's argument of sin in the Conception is overthrown by the fact that in the first moment after Baptism grace can remain '*in anima mundata*,' with the '*infectio corporis per conceptum*,' and so it might have been with the Blessed Virgin Mary '*in primo instanti*,' if God pleased to 'create' grace in her soul. This is his nearest approach to the doctrine of modern Rome; and he at least opposes the system of Perrone. In fact, his opinion on the whole question may be well summed up in the words of Dupin, among his reasons for disbelieving, as he also does, the disputation at Paris. 'Scotus did not propound the opinion of the Immaculate Conception as the certain doctrine of his time, but with some doubt of it; for after he had put the question in his third distinction upon the thirteenth (third) book of the "*Sentences*," whether the Blessed Virgin Mary were conceived without sin, he answers in three propositions—first, that God could have caused her to be born without original sin; second, he could have caused that she should not have continued in it one moment; third, that He could have caused her to remain in it some time, and then in the last instant of that time have purified her from it. After he has proved these three propositions, he concludes that none but God could know which of these things was done; but it seems most probable to him that that which is the most perfect should be attributed to the Blessed Virgin, provided that it be not contrary to the Church nor to Holy Scripture.'¹

¹ Dupin's History of the Fourteenth Century, vol. xii.

So that if we can scarcely assent to the opinion of Suarez, that he inclined to the denial of the doctrine, yet he certainly did not assert it so strongly as to justify his being claimed, decidedly and without doubt, for the affirmative side of the question; much less can he be considered its foremost and peculiar champion. Most probably, he did lean, like S. Bernard, and his immediate predecessors, to a 'sanctificatio in utero,' but with hesitation, as the question was yet undecided either way by the Church.¹

Such, as a whole, was the Marian doctrine of that great body of Divines who followed Peter Lombard. S. Anselm, the second Archbishop of Canterbury after the Norman Conquest, is supposed by some to have introduced it into our own country; but there is much to be urged against this opinion. Mabillon rejects it, and says that 'the observance of the *festival* is to be ascribed to an Abbot of S. Alban's, of the name of Gaufridus,' for, as he thinks, 'the first time in England;' ² but Bulaeus, in his history of the School of Paris, tells us, that its first introduction is due to Corboil, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1140.³

The ascription of both doctrine and festival to S. Anselm, rests upon no better foundation than that afforded by a piece, of doubtful authority, entitled, 'Tractatus de Conceptione Virginali et Peccato Originali.' His argument in the former is no other than the *propriety* of the Blessed Virgin's being free from sin. I. In truth, it was *becoming* that the Virgin should shine with a purity so bright, that none but that of God could be greater; for on her did God the Father so condescend to bestow His only Son, whom He begot coequal with Himself, 'de corde Suo,' and loved as Himself, that He might naturally be one and the same Son, (*communis filius*), both of God the Father and of the Virgin. II. As to herself, he confesses that, as formed by conjugal union, it is a Catholic verity to say that she was under sin. III. Or, at most, was cleansed 'per fidem ante conceptionem,' against which, it is obvious to us to urge S. Bernard's 'non potuit sancta esse antequam *esse*.' Yet, IV. he soon after seems to contradict his former admission, but only as ascribing to her a superhuman power. 'The Creator and Governor of all things has made thee the Lady and Empress

¹ Wadding's account of the controversy is that it was held at Paris, A.D. 1304, and that a marble statue of the Virgin, during its continuance, repeatedly nodded its head in approbation of Scotus' doctrine, and continues to do so 'in hodiernum diem.' The new opinion, he continues, could not have gained ground as it did, but for such a mark of Divine approbation; all the most learned men of the school of S. Thomas opposing it for three centuries. He introduced many new, and revived many old opinions, but this was his chief glory, and it is lauded by the almost universal consent of his posterity.—Annals, tom. vi. p. 52.

² Annal. Benedict. vol. vi. p. 327.

³ Vol. ii. p. 136.

‘ of the heavens and of the earth, as well as of the seas, and of
‘ all the elements, with all the things that are therein. Thou
‘ wert made and art the Lady and Queen.’ As the former
doctrine is so evidently made by him to rest on and result from
the latter, there is no obligation on us to receive it. Appended
to this piece, in the Paris edition of his works, A.D. 1721, is an
account of the manner in which the festival came to be first
introduced, namely, by three different miracles or revelations.
As this history is supposed to be by S. Anselm, and the
maintainers of the doctrine place no slight reliance on its
testimony, we have transferred it in an abbreviated form and in
an English version to our pages:—

At the time when William, the Norman duke, had over-
thrown the power of Harold, and conquered the English in
battle, a certain Abbot Elsiné lived in the Church of the
Apostles Peter and Paul, and of Augustin, the Apostle of
England, in which church repose the bones of Augustin him-
self and the Archbishops who succeeded him. The King of
Denmark, hearing of Harold’s death, determined to invade
England; on which William sent Abbot Elsiné to him to dis-
cover his designs, and, if possible, dissuade him from carrying
his hostile intentions into execution. The Abbot, having
executed his commission, set sail on his return to England, but
was soon overtaken by a violent tempest, which threatened to
destroy both the ship and crew.

In this strait they betook themselves to their prayers, invok-
ing God, the Saints, and especially the Blessed Virgin Mary.
On this there appeared a person dressed in pontifical robes,
who addressed Elsiné by his name,—‘ If you wish to be saved,
‘ if you wish to escape death, if you wish to revisit your
‘ country, if you wish to see your “Lares” once more, promise
‘ most faithfully to observe the festival day of the Conception
‘ of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and teach all those over whom
‘ you have any authority to do the same.’

‘ Thereupon the Abbot Elsiné inquired, as any prudent person
‘ would, “How can I do this, when I am utterly ignorant of the
‘ day on which it should be observed?” The divine messenger
‘ replied, “The 6th of the Ides of December is that joyful day on
‘ which I command you to keep this festival.” “How then,”
‘ said Elsiné, “shall I keep it, and with what service?” To whom
‘ the divine personage very quickly replied, “The service which
‘ is said on the day of her Nativity shall be said on the Con-
‘ ception, only changing the word Nativity into that of Concep-
‘ tion.” The Abbot, when he heard this, gave thanks to God,
‘ and devoutly promised to obey this command immediately.
‘ On his doing so the tempest ceased, and they came with speed

‘to England; and he took care to celebrate this festival himself, and bid many join him in so doing. “To them be given, by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a long life on earth, and after it rest eternal.—Amen.”’

Another miracle is as follows:—

In the time of Charlemagne, the most famous King of France, a deacon, cousin to the King of Hungary, through love of the Mother of Jesus, was accustomed diligently to sing her Hours, but wishing by the advice of his parents to marry a very beautiful lady. . . he remembered one day that he had forgotten to sing them as he was accustomed to do, sent his bride home, and putting all out of the church, he remained alone by the altar of the Virgin; and as he sang and came to the Antiphon, ‘*Pulchra es, et decora, filia Jerusalem,*’ the Virgin Mary suddenly appeared to him, with two Angels, who took hold of his hands; and she said to him, ‘If I am fair and beautiful, why do you forsake me and take another bride? Am I not the more beautiful of the two? Am not I fairer than she? Where have you ever seen one so fair as I?’ He, astonished at this, replied, ‘O Lady, thy beauty exceeds that of all the world—what wouldst thou that I should do?’ She answered, ‘If you will put away the earthly spouse whom you have taken, for the love of me, you shall have me as your bride in the kingdom of heaven; and if you will yearly preach and celebrate my festival on the 6th of the Ides of December, you shall be crowned with me in the kingdom of my Son.’ On this, the Blessed Virgin Mary disappeared; but the deacon refused to return home, and, without the consent of his parents, went to an Abbey which was situated in a distant country; and there, putting on the monastic dress, and being, after a short time, through the merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary, made Bishop of Aquileia, he yearly celebrated the festival of the Conception on the day enjoined, with its proper octaves, and caused it to be celebrated throughout his diocese.

But the most extraordinary of all is the following:—

A French priest, who was in the custom of singing the Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary, returning from a house where he had committed adultery with another man’s wife, entered a boat alone to cross the river Seine—‘*pelagus Sequanæ*;’ and as he sailed, he began to sing the Hours, and when he came to the Invocation ‘*Ave Maria*,’ and was got into the middle of the water, a great crowd of devils overthrew him together with his boat, and carried his soul to hell. On the third day the Mother of Jesus came, with a vast company of Angels, to the place of his torment, and said to the devils, ‘Why do you torment the soul of my servant thus unjustly?’ They replied, ‘We ought

to have him, and rightly, as he was taken in our works.' To which she replied, 'If he is his whose works he was doing, he ought in truth to be mine, as he was saying my matins when you seized him. So that you are more to blame than he is, in having acted thus unfairly to me.' On these words the devils dispersed and fled hither and thither; and the Blessed Virgin Mary restored his soul to its body, and seizing him by the arm, whom she had saved 'ab utroque funere,' she commanded the waters to stand as a wall on the right hand and on the left, and brought him from the depth of the sea to a safe port. He in joy then fell down at her feet, and said, 'O dearest Lady and most beautiful Virgin, thrice grateful to Christ, what shall I give you for the benefits which you have done to me? You have delivered me from the mouth of the lions, and my soul from the most grievous torments of hell.' To whom the Mother of Jesus replied, 'I entreat you not for the future to fall into your former sin, lest a worse fate overtake you; and I beg you besides to celebrate yearly the festival of my Conception on the 6th of the Ides of December, and teach it every where.' When she had said this, she ascended into heaven in his sight; and he, leading an eremitical life, related what had happened to all who wished to hear it. And afterwards, as long as he lived, he celebrated the feast of the Conception solemnly and devoutly, and taught its celebration to all. 'And we, brethren,' S. Anselm concludes, 'by our Archiepiscopal authority, confirm and command that no one be so taken up with things temporal and private, as not to celebrate yearly this festival of the Blessed Virgin Mary. As her Nativity is celebrated in Church, so ought her Conception to be: for unless she had been conceived she could never have been born; and as her Nativity was necessary to our salvation, so was her Conception. By the commandment of God, she was both conceived and born; hence, if divine reason is considered, the day of her *spiritual* Conception ought to be more approved than that of her Nativity.'

In fact, it may be doubted whether S. Anselm would have supported the Roman doctrine, and not rather the contrary, because in his 'Cur Deus Homo,' a genuine work and one of very great merit and value, are to be found the following plain and forcible words:—'Since it appears that He was God and the Reconciler of Sinners, it cannot be doubted that He was wholly without sin; but this could not be, unless *absque peccato de massa peccatrice est assumptus*.'¹

The question still continuing to be agitated by the rival

¹ Lib. ii. cap. 16.

orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans, at Paris, in Spain, and elsewhere, and a formal decision being absolutely necessary for the peace of the Churches and countries concerned in the dispute, the Popes were appealed to for a final and decisive edict on the subject; and we now come to the period when Papal bulls and constitutions take that place in the question which had previously been occupied by the writings of the Schoolmen. Many Popes were more or less closely concerned in the matter; but the first who issued any formal decree, seems to have been Sixtus IV., who, in 1476-7, published a Constitution commencing with the words, '*Cum præcelsa.*' The title of it is as follows: 'To those who celebrate the festival of the Immaculate Conception, and are present at the festival and its octave, the same indulgences are given as are obtained "in Corporis Christi solemnitate."' And, after terming the Blessed Virgin Mary, '*Mater gratiæ, Via misericordiæ, Consolatrix,*' &c., the Pope continues:—

'We consider it right, or rather her due, that all Christian people should give praises and thanks "*de ipsius immaculatæ Virginis mira conceptione.*" and should be present at the masses and other divine offices in Church, that by the intercession and merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary, they may thus be made more fit for Divine Grace.

'Hence, confiding in the power of the same omnipotent God and the blessed Peter and Paul, by our Apostolical authority in this Constitution "*in perpetuum valitura,*" we order and direct that all and each Christian of either sex, who shall celebrate and say the mass and office... of the festival of the Conception of the same glorious Virgin, and through its octaves, according to the pious, devout, and laudable order of our beloved son, Leonard Noguerole, clerk of Verona, and our Notary, and which has emanated from ourselves,—or shall be present at the Canonical hours, shall obtain, as often as they do this, the same indulgences and remissions of sin as they obtain (according to the Constitutions of Urban IV. *Fel. Rec.* approved at the Council of Vienna, and Martin V. and others of our predecessors) who celebrate and say the Mass and Canonical hours on the festival of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, from the first vespers and through the octaves, according to the Constitution of the Church of Rome; or who are present at the Mass and Canonical hours. Given at Rome, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord 1466, 3d of the calends of March, (26th Feb.,) and in the 6th year of our Pontificate.'¹

After this, and in consequence of it, as we have said, came, a few years later, the following Constitution; it is entitled, '*Grave nimis,*' and, without laying down any positive rule of orthodoxy on the subject, it condemns both the assertors and deniers of the doctrine, since the question has not yet been decided by the Church. Having said that he bears with difficulty to hear the sinister reports of those entrusted with the care of the Gospel,

¹ This and the following are found among the Acts of Sixtus IV., in the second volume of the '*Corpus Juris,*' under the year 1476.

and that the more in proportion as offenders and offences grow more dangerous, Sixtus adds,—

‘ Since those errors which are impressed too widely and damnably on the hearts of many by public preaching can with difficulty be removed, and since the holy Roman Church publicly and solemnly celebrates a festival of the Conception of the undefiled and ever-Virgin Mary, and has ordained a special and peculiar office for it, certain preachers of different orders, as we hear, in their sermons to the people, publicly and throughout different cities and countries, do not hesitate to assert or cease to teach daily, that those who hold or say that the same glorious and Immaculate Mother of God was conceived *without* the stain of original sin, offend mortally and are heretics, and that those who celebrate the office of the same Immaculate Conception, and hear the sermons of those who teach these doctrines, sin grievously; and not content with these preachings, they publish books composed upon this argument; from the assertions and preachings of whom no slight scandals have arisen in the minds of the faithful, and still greater are dreaded as about to rise daily. We therefore wishing to put an end to these offences, of our own will and not at the motion of any other, by our apostolical authority and by the tenor of these presents, do reprobate and condemn this assertion of the same preachers, or any others who venture to affirm that they who believe the Blessed Virgin Mary to have been preserved from original sin in her Conception; or who either celebrate the Office of her Conception or hear sermons, incur the guilt of sin,—as false and erroneous, and altogether alien to the truth, with the aforesaid books containing the above teaching.’

Sixtus then decrees that all, of what rank or degree soever, who venture to maintain in their sermons to the people or elsewhere, that the opinions now disapproved by him, are true, shall incur sentence of excommunication, from which, except in *articulo mortis*, they shall not be freed by any but the Pope himself.

‘ At the same time,’ continues this singular document, ‘ we, by our own authority and of our own free will, as aforesaid, do subject to the same penalty and censure all those who venture to say that they who hold the CONTRARY opinion, viz. that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin, incur the crime of heresy or of mortal sin, since the question has not yet been decided by the Roman See. Given at Rome, A.D. 1483, the day before the Calends of September (August 31st), in the 13th year of our Pontificate.’

Eighty years after, viz. in 1568, Pius V.’s bull ‘ Quod a nobis,’ having provided for the uniformity of the Breviaries, and turned out Nogarole’s office, gave 100 days’ indulgence to those ‘ who celebrated either the office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or that ‘ of the dead.’

But in 1570 he published his bull ‘ Super speculum,’ to this effect:—

‘ The seculars and regulars both languish over questions and differences of words, and especially when the conversation turns on the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, contend as pertinaciously for both sides as if this were one of those doctrines which must be believed with the heart and confessed with the mouth, to salvation. When Christ has not spoken, nor the Roman See, the Mother of Churches and *doctrinæ disciplinæ*, decided anything

on the subject, no one can, without temerity, hold either way; and, as to broken cisterns, so do they come to such foolish and unprofitable questions, which generate strife, and which the multitude cannot understand, nor the learned derive any benefit from, but of which the majority are wholly ignorant, understanding neither what the preachers say, nor of what they affirm or deny; thus the minds of many are unsettled and stirred up by those who should rather quiet and compose them.

‘We therefore, following the example of our predecessors, and especially that of the Council of Trent, give to each party permission to hold either side of the question, as he thinks it the more right or the more probable,—of our own will, therefore, and at the prompting of no one whatever, we hereby confirm and republish the Constitutions of Sixtus, which were renewed by Trent.

‘And to render this the more effectual, we order and direct that no one, of what order, degree, or dignity soever, do in any popular assemblies, or in any place where there is a promiscuous concourse of men and women accustomed to meet together, dispute at all on this question, or endeavour, by arguments or the authority of the Doctors, to make good his own opinion, or destroy that of his opponents; or presume to write or dictate on the matter in the vulgar tongue, under pretence of piety or necessity; and whoever breaks this order, shall, if a Cleric, be deprived and suspended from all his ranks and dignities whatever, and be rendered incapable of future promotion, except at the hands and by the absolution of the Pope for the time being, and be subject, if needs be, to any other penalties from his own Bishop, according to the measure of his offence.’

‘But it shall be allowed, as long as the Apostolic See has not decided the question, for learned men, in public seminaries, or chapters, or elsewhere, when no scandal can ensue, to discuss the question, and to attack or defend either side—so that neither of the two opinions be treated as erroneous, and all the rules laid down by our predecessor Sixtus be kept, which, as before said, we now renew. All ordinaries, vicars, and officials whatever, are commanded to see that this bull is published in every Diocese, under pain of excommunication.’¹

Among the bulls of Paul V., in the year 1616, we find that of ‘*Regis pacifici*,’ which ‘renews the Constitutions of Sixtus IV.’ (given above), ‘of the Council of Trent, and of Pius V.’

‘Yet,’ it continues, ‘in despite of these, differences and scandals still continue, and are in great danger of increasing; and we therefore order that the penalties contained in the above be renewed in all cases of offence against their rule, until the controversy is decided by the Roman See.’²

Six years after this, A.D. 1622, Gregory XV., Paul V.’s successor, issued his ‘*Sanctissimus Dominus noster*,’ which, if more stringent in its penalties, is not more conclusive in its Theological decision:—

‘He forbade the doctrine that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived in sin, to be held in any public assembly whatever, under pain of the censures laid down by the previous Popes; but by this prohibition,’ continues the Pontiff, ‘it is not our intention to reprobate the opposite opinion, but to leave it where it is, forbidding those who hold the negative to meddle with such as prefer the opposite side of the question;’ and he proceeds ‘to forbid the *latter* to be handled, even in private writings or conversations,’ but with

¹ Cherubini’s ‘*Ballarium*,’ tom. ii. p. 343.

² Ibid. tom. iii. p. 391.

a reassertion 'that it is not his intention to close the question, but to suffer it to remain undecided, as was done by Sixtus IV., Pius V., and Paul V.' Yet he further orders, 'that the Holy Roman Church do celebrate the festival of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and do use therein only the word "Conception," under the penalties before mentioned.'¹

This last addition has given some ground for the festival's having been ascribed, in fact, to Gregory XV.

But this rule being also found insufficient to close the question, Alexander VII., at the entreaty of the court of Spain, that the Pope would give some authoritative decision which should put a final end to those differences and divisions which still continued to exist, published in the year 1661 the bull '*Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum*,' saying that—

'Whereas the belief that the soul of the Blessed Virgin Mary was in the first moment of her creation, and of its infusion into her body, by special grace and privilege of God, and through the merits of her Son preserved from all stain of original sin—in which sense the Conception is observed by the faithful—was increased by the Constitutions of Sixtus IV. and of Trent, so that it now prevails throughout almost all the Church Catholic, and because the opposite opinion arose in the Church, with much offence to God, and scandals among the people; therefore Paul V. forbade it to be held, and Gregory XV. renewed his prohibition.

'Yet the Church of Spain and the King have sent to us to say, that the denial of the Immaculate Conception still holds its ground, and that many do not hesitate to say that the Church of Rome does not forbid it,—thereby causing numerous offences.'

To support his predecessors and uphold the festival and doctrine, he renews their former constitutions, ordering,

'That all and each who venture to attack the festival by arguments of any kind, shall hereby be subjected to the penalties laid down by Sixtus IV., of deprivation, with permission to receive Absolution only from the Pontiff himself. Whilst the books in which the doctrine or festival are disputed about, written, or to be written hereafter, shall be placed in the list of prohibited works.

'Yet it is also forbidden—keeping to Sixtus IV.'s constitutions—to term the doctrine that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived in sin, either heresy or mortal sin, since the question is not decided nor intended to be decided now.'²

But the most extraordinary part of the history of this portion of the Bullarium yet remains to be told. It is a maxim, as all know, of the Church of Rome that every word of S. Peter, uttered through his successor, is binding on the whole Church, and that no rule once issued by him can ever afterwards fall to the ground or be forgotten. Perrone's work is avowedly an inquiry, 'whether a dogmatic decree can be defined' by the Pope, which shall once and for ever decide that the doctrine in question is a part of the Catholic faith. And Pius IX., as we shall shortly see, has since proposed the same question to the

¹ Cherubini, tom. iii. p. 477.

² Ibid. tom. vi. p. 152,

whole Hierarchy of the Roman Church. Yet this has in fact actually been done already—and no longer ago than the year 1708, by Pope Clement XI., who, in his Bull ‘*Commissi nobis Divinitus*,’ speaks thus:—

‘The “ratio” of the sacred Apostolate divinely committed to us, demands that, after the manner of so many Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, we should increase and spread throughout all lands the worship of the most glorious Virgin Mary “*Dei genetricis*,” whose conception caused joy to the whole world, and who, exalted above the bands of angels, is a careful petitioner for every Christian, interceding earnestly in Heaven with Him whom she bore. We ourselves earnestly labour, as far as is granted to us from on high, to merit her most powerful assistance in the midst of so many and great necessities of the Christian State and Catholic Church, by which we are oppressed.

‘Incited then by our sincere devotion to the same most august Queen of heaven, our patroness and advocate, we, of our Apostolical authority and by the tenor of these presents, do direct, decree, and command, that the festival of the Conception of the Blessed and Immaculate Virgin Mary be henceforth celebrated every where throughout the world, by all and each of the faithful of either sex, as the other festivals.

‘All other and contrary Apostolical Constitutions and orders whatsoever notwithstanding.’

And in conclusion it directs that,

‘Copies of this bull be made under the hand of the public notary, and the seal of some one of Ecclesiastical dignity, to which the same obedience shall be shown as would have been given to these presents, could they have been published or publicly exhibited.

‘*Dictum Romæ ap. Sanctum Petrum sub Annulo Piscatoris, die vi. Dec. MDCCVIII. Pontificatus nostri anno nono.*’¹

It remains therefore to be shown how, with such a document as this, the question can any longer be treated as an open one by the Church of Rome, or what additional authority any bull issued by Pius IX. could have over and above this of Clement’s. Nor can we avoid the expression of our surprise that Perrone and Pius IX. should have so completely overlooked what is nothing less than a formal and decisive edict and law of their Church, as never once to allude to it in any manner whatever. It is true, that Clement orders the celebration of the *festival*, whilst Pius IX. regards rather the establishment of the *doctrine* of the Immaculate Conception. But we reply: first, that the institution of the former clearly implies and presupposes the existence of the latter, if it have any meaning at all,—at least it does so on any other grounds of morality than the very questionable one of Gregory XV., already alluded to,—and even if it were not so, we must still urge, in the second place, that Pius IX., in his particular object of defining and declaring the *doctrine* of the Immaculate Conception, has been anticipated by

¹ Bullarium Romanum, 1735, tom. x. part 1.

his predecessor, Gregory XVI., in the addition of the term 'Immaculata,' which, as we have said, that Pope ventured to make to the preface of the Mass of the Conception, and other like interpolations; so that the issue of any such decree as that contemplated by him, would be simply supererogatory, not to say a mere absurdity.

Yet such he certainly does contemplate, for from Gaeta, in the year 1849, he issued the following document, entitled, 'Encyclical Letter of the Pope on the Mystery of the Immaculate Conception :—

'To our Venerable Brethren, the Patriarchs, Primate, Archbishops, and Bishops of the whole Catholic world. Pius P. P. IX.

'VENERABLE BRETHREN,—Health and Apostolical Benediction. As soon as, by the counsel of Divine Providence, and certainly for no merit of our own, we were raised to the lofty throne of the Prince of the Apostles, and undertook the government of the universal Church, it was our chiefest consolation, venerable Brethren, to learn how, in the pontificate of our predecessor, Gregory XVI. of blessed memory, there had sprung up in a wonderful manner, throughout the Catholic world, a most ardent desire that the Apostolic See should at length, by some solemn judgment, define that the most holy Mother of God, the most loving mother of us all, the Immaculate Virgin Mary, had been conceived without original sin. This most pious desire is clearly and openly testified and demonstrated by the continual petitions which have been addressed to our predecessor, and also to ourselves, by the most illustrious bishops, chapters, and religious orders—among these, the renowned order of Friars Preachers was foremost in imploring permission, publicly and openly, to pronounce and add in the sacred Liturgy, and especially in the Preface of the Mass of the Conception of the most Blessed Virgin, the word *Immaculate*. These petitions were most willingly granted, as well by our predecessor as by ourselves. To all this, venerable Brethren, have been added the letters of very many of your colleagues, incessantly addressed to our predecessor and ourselves, begging, with reiterated petitions and redoubled zeal, that we should define it as a doctrine of the Catholic Church, that the Conception of the most Blessed Virgin Mary was altogether Immaculate, and utterly free from all stain of original sin. Neither have there been wanting, in this age of ours, men of eminent abilities, virtue, piety, and learning, who, in their erudite and laborious writings, have thrown such light on this argument and most devout opinion, that not a few have wondered how the Church and Apostolic See should refrain from decreeing to the most holy Virgin this honour, which the common piety of the faithful eagerly desires should be paid to her by the authority and solemn judgment of that Church and See.

'These desires, indeed, have been most acceptable and delightful to us, who, from our earliest years, have had nothing dearer, nothing more at heart, than to revere the most Blessed Virgin Mary with an especial piety and homage, and the most intimate affections of our heart, and to do everything which might seem likely to procure her greater glory and praise, and to amplify her worship. From the very beginning of our pontificate, therefore, we have, with the utmost alacrity and earnestness, turned our anxious thoughts towards a matter of such moment; and we have never omitted to pour out humble and fervent prayers to Almighty God, that He might vouchsafe to illumine our mind with the light of His heavenly grace, that we might know what we were to do in this affair. Indeed, it is now our

chief hope and confidence, that the most Blessed Virgin, who "has raised the eminence of her merits above all the choirs of Angels, even to the throne of the Deity,"¹ and has, by the foot of her power, crushed the head of the ancient serpent, and who "set up between Christ and the Church"² all sweetness and the plentitude of graces, has ever rescued the people of Christ from the direst calamities and the snares and violence of all enemies, and saved them from utter ruin,—will now have pity on us with a mother's love; and by her most august, ready, and prevailing power with God, will, as she is ever wont, turn away the most sad and mournful reverses, the bitter distresses, labours, and necessities, and the scourges of the Divine wrath, wherewith for our sins we are afflicted; and calm and dissipate those tumultuous storms of various ills, wherewith, to our incredible grief, the Church is everywhere tossed to and fro,—and finally turn our sorrow into joy. You know full well, venerable Brethren, that the whole ground of our confidence is placed on the most holy Virgin, since God "has vested the plenitude of all good in Mary; so that henceforth, if there be in us any hope, if there be any grace, if there be any health, we know that it is from her that it redounds, . . . for such hath been the will of Him who would have us possess all through Mary."³

'We have, therefore, selected certain ecclesiastics of known piety, and eminently versed in theological studies, together with some of our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, illustrious for virtue, religion, counsel, prudence, and the knowledge of divine things; and to them we have committed the duty of examining with the minutest accuracy, and with all their prudence and erudition, this most momentous question; and they are to use all diligence in laying their opinions before us. While the matter is in this state, we have determined to follow the footsteps of our illustrious predecessors, and to emulate their examples; and in pursuance of this determination, venerable Brethren, we address these letters to you, in order that we may greatly rouse your well-known devotion and episcopal solicitude; and we charge you solemnly, each of you according to your own judgment and discretion, to command public prayers in your diocese, and to see to the fulfilment of your command, that the most merciful Father of lights may vouchsafe to shed upon us the heavenly brightness of His divine Spirit, and to give us an inspiration from above, in order that, in a matter of such moment, we may be able to take that course which shall be to the greater glory of His holy name, to the greater praise of the most Blessed Virgin, and for the greater good of the Church on earth. We have a lively wish that you should, as soon as possible, make known to us with what devotion your Clergy and faithful people are animated towards the Conception of the Immaculate Virgin, and what desire they have to behold the Apostolic See promulgate a decree in this matter. We above all desire to know, venerable Brethren, what are in this respect the wishes and feelings of your eminent wisdom.

'And as we have already permitted to the Roman clergy to recite a certain office of the Conception of the most holy Virgin, composed and printed very recently, in place of the office which is found in the ordinary Breviary, we also accord to you, venerable Brothers, the faculty of permitting all the clergy of your dioceses, if you judge it convenient, to recite freely and lawfully the same office of the Conception of the most holy Virgin which is actually used by the Roman clergy, without your demanding this permission of us, or of our sacred Congregation of Rites.

¹ S. Gregory, *Pass. de Exposit. in Libros Regum.*

² S. Bernard. *Serm. in cap. xii. Apocalyps.*

³ S. Bernard. in *Nativit. S. Mariæ de Aquæducta.*

'We make no doubt, venerable Brothers, but that your singular piety towards the most blessed Virgin will make you, with the utmost diligence and the most lively interest, comply with the desires we express to you, and that you will hasten to transmit to us, within a convenient time, the answers which we require of you. Meanwhile, receive as a pledge of all celestial favours, and above all as a witness of our good-will towards you, the Apostolic benediction, which we give from the bottom of our heart to you, venerable Brethren, as well as to all the clergy and all the faithful laity entrusted to your vigilance.

'Given at Gaeta, on the 2d day of February, in the year 1849, in the third year of our Pontificate.'

This 'Papal Address' produced the following 'Pastoral of the Bishop of Melipotamus on the Pope's Encyclical Letter on the 'Mystery of the Immaculate Conception:—

'NICHOLAS, by the grace of God, and the favour of the Apostolic See, Bishop of Melipotamus, and Vicar-apostolic of the London District, to our dearly-beloved in Christ, the Clergy, secular and regular, and the laity of the London District, health and benediction in the Lord.

'If the banishment of our Holy Father from Rome has been to us a cause of sorrow, God has in part also turned it into a source of consolation; for while, on the one hand, it has given occasion to the whole Catholic world to testify its love and reverence for the Supreme Pontiff in his afflictions, more almost than when he filled a temporal throne, it has no less shown him to us calmly exercising in his place of exile those highest prerogatives of universal rule over the Church, whereof no temporal calamities can deprive the successor of S. Peter.

'Not only, dearly beloved in Christ, has he carefully provided for the continuance of the ordinary functions of church government, but his thoughts and his heart have been filled with those greater duties which belong to his high office—the guardianship of the faith, and the promotion of piety and devotion.

'With these great objects before him, his Holiness Pope Pius IX. has addressed to all the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops of the Catholic Church an Encyclical Letter, or circular, the purport of which we cannot better make known to you than by laying before you the principal part of the valuable document itself.' (Here followed the principal part of the Encyclical Letter.)

'To no part of the Catholic Church can this announcement and this call to prayer be more welcome than to us, dearly beloved, whose fathers so particularly held and promoted belief in this mystery of Mary's Immaculate Conception, and gave to the Church the feast in which it is commemorated. Who, then, shall feel more anxious than we to learn the decision of so great a point, the sure holding of which by the affections, as well as by the confident belief of the faithful, has been already a source of so many blessings to the Church? Who shall pray more fervently than we, that the Spirit of God will guide the counsels of the Holy Father to the right definition of so important a doctrine, which interests the dearest feelings of every breast alive to the prerogatives of Mary? It is, in truth, a solemn and most moving occurrence, when the Church of God, not aroused from without by the assaults of heresy, nor alarmed within by the creeping spread of baneful error, but moved and almost uplifted by the heaving and swelling piety of her own best children, rises up to declare a dogma of faith; which needs not to be hedged with anathemas to guard it, but lodges at once safely in the glad embrace of every Catholic heart; which bears not

with it one drop of bitter condemnation, but sheds forth on every side a new fragrance and a new sweetness over the surface and within the soul of the entire Catholic world. And if the chief pastor of the Church has, in his humility, condescended to solicit your prayers, that he may be rightly guided in so important a matter, you will not certainly refuse to give them, in all the simplicity of your faith, and the fervour of your filial love.

'The month of May, sacred in the Church to the Blessed Mother of God, comes most opportunely to favour the discharge of this pleasing duty. Gladly have we seen the devotion of this month spread rapidly through this country, and afford much joy and consolation to every class of the faithful. But we feel every confidence that, with the new impulse now given, it will become universal, and be observed with increased fervour. We trust that in every church or chapel in our district, where it is possible, some devotion will be performed and instruction will be given, with reference to the peculiar dedication of the month to Mary, the immaculate Virgin Mother of God. And where this cannot be done daily, nor even several times in the week, let it be on Sundays at least. Anxious, therefore, to unite the particular object of prayer enjoined by the Holy Father with the annual and more general devotion of the season, the Bishops Vicars-apostolic of all England assembled, according to their wont, in London, have unanimously resolved to address their flocks in the same words, through this their and our Pastoral, published by each in his own district, that so there may be a uniform and joint supplication sent up to the Throne of Grace from the whole body of the faithful, priests and people. And all unite in ordering and strongly recommending to the piety of all Catholics the following mode of carrying out his Holiness' desire :—

'First.—This Pastoral shall be read in every church and chapel, on Sunday, the 29th instant.

'Secondly.—The month of May shall be kept as sacred to the Blessed Virgin, in the best mode that this can be done, according to the circumstances of each mission.

'Thirdly.—Where there is a daily or frequent special devotion, the Litany of Loretto shall be said or sung; where benediction is given, in that office.

'Fourthly.—There shall also be sung or recited the hymn *Veni Creator*, with the usual versicle, response, and prayer; to which must be added the prayer *Mentes nostras*, from the Mass of Wednesday in Whitsun-week.

'Fifthly.—Where no special observance of the month can be kept, the Litany and hymn as above shall be sung or recited every Sunday during the month.

'Sixthly.—The faithful are earnestly exhorted to offer up at least one Communion during the month for the intention of the Holy Father.

'Nothing doubting, dearly beloved, that you will gladly embrace the opportunity thus afforded you of practising devotion towards the Blessed Mother of God, and promoting her honour, and through it that of her thrice-blessed Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, we hereby impart and communicate to you that special Apostolic benediction which the Father of the Faithful on this occasion fervently bestows on all his spiritual children.

'Given at London, this 23d day of April, being the feast of St. George, patron of England, in the year of our Lord, 1849.

✠ NICHOLAS, Bishop of Melipotamus.'

Here the matter at present rests. On the whole, therefore, we may surely say, that on this question at least there is not, and never has been, any one doctrine uniformly taught in the Church of Rome, but that Doctors have opposed Doctors, and Popes have opposed Popes; some leaning to the affirmative, others to

the negative, and others, again, and by far the largest number, avowedly leaving it open and undecided. So forcible are the statements of Launoy, a Jansenist of the seventeenth century, to this effect, that we venture, before quitting the subject, to give a digest of his two treatises on it, the more so as much that he tells us rests on local sources of information, to which few can have access.

His first treatise, which is divided into Prescriptions, like Tertullian's work against the Heretics, treats the doctrine generally. In the first Prescription he sets out with laying it down that 'the question is to be decided from the words of Scripture, and 'the voice of the Fathers and Councils.'

Presc. 2. 'If the question had been raised any time before the year 1300, it would have been decided that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived in sin like other human creatures.'

Presc. 3. 'From the time of J. D. Scotus, 1308, the writers are of suspicious character and slight authority, and Scotus' own arguments are "vana ac futilia," as resting neither on Holy Scripture nor on Ecclesiastical Tradition.'

Presc. 4. 'At first the Franciscans themselves rejected the Immaculate Conception. Alvarus, A.D. 1330, approved the opposite opinion; as did S. Alexander, S. Thomas, S. Bonaventura; and he called the Immaculate Conception "nova et phantastica."—(Yet Alvarus only speaks of a 'Sanctificatio post Conceptionem,' not of an Immaculate Conception properly so called. Then follows a list of names of no particular note on the primitive side of the question.)

Presc. 6. 'In the course of time the Franciscans deserted their opinion, or rather the doctrine of the Church. The Preachers, however, always kept it, and needed neither revelations nor any other like kind of assistance. "Veritas, hominum mendacio non eget."

Presc. 7. 'So with the Jesuits. They soon deserted the moderation of Loyola and their other early Doctors. Maldonatus disapproved the Immaculate Conception, as appears from his having reprehended the University of Paris, A.D. 1574, for introducing it and requiring an oath from their members to support it; which caused much disturbance, the Bishop of Paris siding with Maldonatus, and ended in an unsatisfactory appeal to the Pope. At this time the Jesuits thought differently to what they did afterwards.'

Presc. 9. Launoy brings against the doctrine thirteen citations from the Theological writings of seven Popes, viz. four from S. Leo, (A.D. 461,) to show that Jesus Christ alone, as having been Conceived miraculously, is Immaculate in His Conception. The following words of one of them may serve as a specimen of

the whole. 'Jesus Christ our Lord, alone among the sons of men, was innocent in His birth, because He alone was conceived without the stain of carnal concupiscence.'

Two from Gelasius, (Pope, A.D. 496,)—'Whatsoever our first parents produced of their seed, was indeed the work of God according to the institution of nature, but was not without the contagion of sin, which it inherited from their first disobedience.'

One from S. Gregory, (A.D. 590,)—'John the Baptist was conceived in sin, Christ alone was conceived without sin,—both indeed were born in Grace, and therefore the Nativity of both is celebrated, but only the Conception of Christ.'

Three from Innocent III. (A.D. 1216,)—'Mary was born in sin, but she brought forth without sin.'

One from Innocent V. (A.D. 1276,)—'It seems pious and right, though not found in Scripture, that shortly after her "Animatio," either in the very day or hour, but not in the actual moment, she should have been sanctified.'

One from John XXII. or Benedict XII. (A.D. 1342,) on the Assumption: 'She passed, firstly, from a state of original sin; secondly, from a state of "filiatio" to maternal honour; thirdly, from a state of "misery" to one of glory.'

One from Clement VI. (A.D. 1352,)—'I suppose that, according to common opinion, the Blessed Virgin Mary was in original sin for a short period, because, according to all, as soon as she could be sanctified she was sanctified.' After Clement came Sixtus IV., whom, as already said, Launoy accuses 'of having deformed and corrupted the original doctrine.'

Presc. 11 tells us that 'the addition of the Council of Trent to its decree on original sin, which we have already cited, is probably spurious, because it is not found in the Paris editions of 1546, 1551, 1555, and others.' But this seems doubtful, as it is found in the Milan edition of 1548, and is said, by the Dominican Catharinus, who was present, to have been received with the unanimous consent of the whole Council—and Launoy himself soon afterwards virtually abandons his objection.

The second and last division consists of an inquiry how the University of Paris, after their change of opinion and the oath which they forced on their members, stands affected,

1st. To the Church of Rome, from the year 1497 (that of the above change of opinion and decree) to 1575 (the year of the condemnation of the Maculate Conception, as held by Maldonatus, 'as heretical.')

2d. To the Council of Trent, from the year 1546 (the year of the Council) to 1575.

As the University in question was for a long time the head-

quarters of the Immaculate Conception, this dissertation is, in fact, an inquiry into the tenableness of the doctrine itself.—

‘Two chief points occur with regard to the first epoch—one with regard to the second.

‘The first is the definition of the Council of Basle, (A.D. 1439,) Session 36, that, on this doubtful question, after well weighing both sides, they decided for the Immaculate Conception.’

From this result the following ‘Considerations’ :—

‘Consid. 1. This Council, at the 36th Session, had not the same authority as it had up to the end of the 27th. The Pope’s bull to move it to Ferrara was pronounced by it to be null and void in the 29th Session, and those who obeyed him were excommunicated. In the 34th Session the Council deposed Eugenius. On account of this schism the Council did not represent the whole Church.

‘Consid. 2. The decision of Basle is not to be endured, as disregarding the ancient Tradition of the Roman Church, which was originally as follows. Innocent III. (A.D. 1216) says in his sermon on the Purification, “when the Holy Ghost came upon Mary she was ‘mundata a fomite carnis;’ she was visited by the Holy Ghost before, ‘in utero matris,’ when He cleansed her soul from original sin, yet Christ alone was conceived ‘sine culpa.’”’

Here follow other citations, similar to those given before, from the Popes.

‘Consid. 3.—1. The Council was not right in saying that the Immaculate Conception was a doctrine consonant with Ecclesiastical cultus, because the Church of Rome had altered the Office a century before the Council, originally observing, as in other Churches, not the feast of the Conception, but that of the Sanctification.

‘2. The Council, again, calls the Immaculate Conception a “doctrine agreeable to the Catholic faith.” This “agreeableness” was wanting in the Roman Church in the times of Innocent III. (A.D. 1216), ‘Innocent V.’ (A.D. 1276,) ‘John XXII.’ (A.D. 1342,) ‘Clement VI.’ (A.D. 1352.) ‘And yet the two Innocents and Clement were Paris Doctors, and most worthily promoted to the Pontificate—nor is there any thing on the doctrine in the three great Creeds of the Apostles, Nice, or S. Athanasius.

‘3. It also terms it “agreeable to reason.” Natural reason has nothing to do with such a question either way; and Christian reason was, in this case, also wanting in the Roman Church in the times of the above Popes.

‘Lastly, it is pronounced to be “according to Holy Scripture,” in which case the meaning of Scripture was wholly unknown to the Church, during the times of the same Popes, the heads of it. Nor do the citations brought from Scripture to support the doctrine, at all apply to it, but they are mere fallacies, as concluding from a particular to a general. So that the reasons adduced by this Council for the doctrine are “most weak and contemptible.”’

The second point is Sixtus IV.’s Decree ‘Grave nimis,’ issued A. D. 1483—and given by us already—‘on which,’ Launoy says, ‘it is plain,—

‘1. That the asserters and deniers of the Immaculate Conception mutually accused each other of heresy.

‘2. That tumults had been raised on both sides.

' 3. That Sixtus had not fully fathomed the opinion of either side, since he says, "the question is not yet decided by the Church."

Fourteen years afterwards—(A.D. 1497)—came the Paris decree on the subject—on which says Launoy:—

' 1. The words of it, "*majorum nostrorum vestigia sequentes*," can only refer back one century, for before that period the Paris Doctors stood by the contrary doctrine. By it the following list of their own authorities, all of the first place "*dignitatum splendore, doctrinæ et morum sanctitatis laude*," are branded as teaching a doctrine termed by their successors "*false, impious, and erroneous*," viz.—

' Clement VI.—William Okam, Nicholas de Lyra, Alexander of Hales, Franciscans.

' Durandus, Bishop of Meux, Preacher.

' Innocent V., S. Thomas, S. Bonaventure, Albertus Magnus, Dominicans; Peter Lombard, &c. &c.

' 2. It appears from Gerson that even Bishops have no power to term any proposition heretical, of which, "*ex se et ex jure*," it is altogether doubtful if it oppose the faith,—which is not scandalous—and ignorance as to the truth or falsehood of which can exist "*sine periculo*;" and as of course he did not grant to the priesthood what he denied to the Episcopate, he would not have thought the Faculty right in declaring the Maculate Conception to be "*false, impious, and erroneous*."

' 3. Nor did the Council of Basle so condemn it.

' 4. The Faculty also opposed Sixtus IV., who left the question open, thereby nullifying their brand of the negative opinion. . . . From hence arose very great scandals, and no one can venture to deny that there was both a very wide and a very plain contradiction between Sixtus IV. and the Faculty of Paris.

' Now to come to the year 1575.

' But first, by the way, in 1546, Trent, in the 5th Session, published its declaration at the end of the decree on original sin. Fourteen years after, the Faculty of Paris condemned, among other propositions, the following, "No one but Christ is without original sin, and the Blessed Virgin Mary was dead through the sin she derived from Adam; and all her sufferings through life, like those of the Saints and Martyrs, were punishments of sin—original or actual;" declaring it to be "*heretical in all its assertions, and injurious to the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints*."

' The Faculty passed a like censure at the end of 1574, and the beginning of 1575—Maldonatus opposed them, and the Faculty branded him with heresy.

' On this observe, 1st, That the Faculty have gone from the Council of Basle, which did not, like them, define the Immaculate Conception to be held "*de fide*."

' 2. It has also gone from the Church of Rome and the Apostolic See, which, as Sixtus IV. said, has not yet decided the question.

' 3. It has broken the permission which Sixtus gave, that each side should continue to hold its own opinion, so that neither termed the other heretical.

' 4. It has disobeyed the injunction of Trent, directing that Sixtus IV.'s "*prescription*" should be observed.

' 5. It has, "*ipso facto*," incurred the censure of Sixtus IV. on those who should break that order—and has thereby confirmed its "*dissidium*" with the Council of Basle, Sixtus IV. and Trent.

' So that the state of the University of Paris, first to the Church of Rome, from the year 1497 to 1575, second to Trent, from the year 1546 to 1575, is one of discord and most evident schism.

"It will not be foreign to the purpose briefly to state in this place the judgment given by Cardinal Perrone on the subject, "The Doctors of the Sorbonne," he says, "stand by it; S. Thomas opposed it; both opinions might have something said for them, but if either is better than the other, I judge that of the Dominicans to be more in accordance with S. Augustin and the other Fathers."

"Lastly, as regards the *form* of the University's oath. They bind themselves thus: "You shall swear that you will maintain the opinion of the Faculty on the Conception of the Immaculate Virgin, namely, that in her Conception she was preserved from original sin." This is the original oath, first published in the year 1497, and republished three times, once in 1560, and twice in 1575. By it they bring themselves into a position of schism with Rome, the Council of Trent, and their own bishop, who took the part of Maldonatus,—they incur the guilt of perjury according to Alexander, "that those oaths which are against public truth and the institutes of the holy Fathers are not to be called oaths but perjuries;"—they set themselves above a General Council—Trent, in taking away a licence which it had granted,—and they give room for its being said that a General Council can err; since Trent rules one thing, and they rule another, and a very different one; and lastly they will compel a defender of the faith to brand themselves with a mark of censure—and so the whole controversy "ad ignominiam Catholicorum redibit."

Such is the language against the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, of one of the most learned and eminent of Romish controversialists. His arguments are in truth what he terms them himself—unanswerable; and they derive the more force from the fact that he is no enemy to the Church whose particular novelty he is opposing, but, on the contrary, he proves himself her honest and genuine disciple; this he does both by the way in which he speaks of the Pope as the head of the whole Church, and of Trent as a General Council, and especially as he identifies the Church Catholic with the Church of Rome. Indeed he carries out this principle so honestly, that while he rejects one phase of Romish doctrine on this subject, he adopts another, viz. the 'Sanctificatio in utero,' which he does not fear to term the 'primitive tradition,' but for proof of which, our readers will not fail to observe, that he neither goes further back than the year 1216, nor once looks beyond the pale of Rome.

Can we imagine any of the real and undoubted articles of the Catholic faith being so treated by an opponent, as Launoy treats this? Can the Doctors of the Church of Rome point to a single doctrine on which any primitive Bishops, or the successors of S. Peter, if they will, and the heads of the Universal Church, have so ruled as the modern Popes have done on the Immaculate Conception? And what would have become of Christianity, at its outset, if they could? In fact, we repeat that there have been three different systems on the Blessed Virgin Mary; one, and one only, is that of the early Church interpreting and speaking for Scripture; the other two belong

exclusively to Rome. The first extends down to the times of S. Bernard, and teaches that all the natural descendants of Adam, without one exception, are under sin, both original and actual, and that the Blessed Virgin Mary is not excepted. The second, extending from S. Bernard to Clement XI., holds a Conception indeed in sin, but a perfect cleansing immediately afterwards; and the third and last demands a perfect Immaculateness both in and before the Conception. The first, as we have said, is supported by Holy Writ and the early Saints; the second claims to rest on miracles and miraculous revelations; the third has gradually been evolved from the second, of which it is, in plain terms, a correction and an improvement. What would Rome say were another Church to take on itself so to manufacture a doctrine, producing, after centuries of hesitation, intrigue, internal discord, cavillings, and self-contradictions, a system which, when at length exposed to the light of day, was found to be so utterly hostile to the peculiar prerogative of Him who, condescending to be born of a daughter of Adam, yet was the Son of no earthly father, but was conceived, that His birth should be without spot, even of the Holy Ghost? In such a case she might perhaps claim, with some truth,—with more at least than she can now,—to be the sole representative of our Heavenly Master, and the one depository of His truth on earth.

And as to Perrone's arguments, apart from his proofs, nothing can be conceived more weak and inconclusive! Thus he relies much on Sixtus IV. and the Council of Trent, yet it may be allowed us to say, that something of the contradiction which Launoy proves to exist between these authorities and the University of Paris, is found, in their turn, between Scripture and them. The former plainly says that *all* the children of Adam are under sin; the latter, on the contrary, say that *not* all are so, but that there may be, and is an exception.

Then, as to his conclusion from the words of Job xiv. 4, 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one,'—if it is to be so strictly applied to Christ as the Son of Mary, as to render it necessary that she must have been conceived and born without any stain of sin, that so He might be holy (!)—what becomes of it when she herself is to be born in her turn? and what can it issue in at last but in one of these two alternatives, viz. either that Adam could not have been defiled, or that Mary could not have been purified?

Again, Perrone positively ventures to bring forward, as no weak argument on his side, 'the universal consent of the people even from the time of S. Augustin,' and that in the face of S. Bernard's words, that the doctrine and festival were alike

unheard of before his time; words which, when we consider S. Bernard's own place in the controversy, are most decisive against Perrone; for although, as we have said, it is S. Bernard's name alone that has prevented the primitive doctrine from having been condemned and branded as heresy by the Popes long ago, yet we should remember that he is not to be regarded in it as anything like a champion of the really Catholic faith.

It is to him that the Mediævalists look, as the support of their doctrine of a 'Sanctificatio in utero,' and he is to be regarded as holding a middle place in the question. Both as compared with the early Fathers and the later Church of Rome, he appears as an antagonist; by the side of the former he is found to have said much more than he was warranted in saying, whilst it is evident that he falls as far short of the full requirements of the latter; and thus, as the only alternative, he holds that mediæval doctrine which is, in fact, the mean between them.

At page 236, Perrone argues thus:—

'That a tradition of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary having once existed in the Church, it could never have been subsequently destroyed, nor could any other have sprung up in its place. But the existence of this doctrine in the present day shows that it must, therefore, have existed always, and that, in consequence, the Bible assertions that all the posterity of Adam were under sin, must have excluded the Blessed Virgin Mary; and the Fathers who opposed Pelagianism, and who also laid down an universal proposition as to his sin attaching to all his posterity, must have admitted the exclusion.'

Yet, a few pages further on (p. 277) he states, but is unable to refute, the assertions of such men as Cajetan, Launoy, and Belarmine, that 'there is no foundation for the "*pia sententia*," so called, either in Sacred Scripture or in Ecclesiastical Tradition; nay, that they both oppose it with sufficient plainness.'

There are, in truth, but two facts to which they appeal with any show of reason for the support of the 'Sanctificatio in utero,' and none whatever to bear out the doctrine of Perrone. These are, firstly, the case of Jeremiah and John the Baptist; and, secondly, the passage of S. Augustin, first quoted by Peter Lombard, that 'in the case of the Blessed Virgin Mary he would rather not entertain any question about sin at all.' For the first, one of their own Popes confesses, as we have seen from Launoy, 'that John and Jeremiah were indeed sanctified before their birth, but that Christ only was conceived without sin;' but the doctrine of a mere 'Sanctificatio' is now positively rejected and condemned by the Church of Rome. For the second, it is surely a very different thing for S. Augustin to say that he would rather not entertain a question, to what it would have been had he plainly declared that the question did not exist to be entertained. It seems to us that his words imply, not the

existence of sinlessness in the Blessed Virgin Mary, but the express contrary; at least, a way to test the question may be, to ask ourselves whether we ourselves should be content to receive, or whether S. Augustin would have thought of giving, such a statement, as sufficient, of the sinlessness of Christ? Yet, according to the Church of Rome, the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin Mary, though of grace only, is as perfect in degree as His.

In fact, the maintenance of the doctrine will involve this Church in numberless difficulties, the results of which cannot probably be yet foreseen. At the outset we have in it a proof that an infallible body (so called) can hold a doctrine so plainly opposed in principle, if not in mere words, to Scripture, that all intelligent minds must see, sooner or later, that the infallibility of one or other must fall. If, too, the Church (of Rome) can err in a doctrine, she can also err as to miracles, and the contrary; and in this case her claim of inerrability must give way, as that of her infallibility is already endangered.

It is, indeed, strictly true, however startling it may appear, that Perrone himself does not trust and act on his own principles, but, without intending it, he gives them up from the very outset. He first claims for the Pope a hyper-œcumenical authority, and immediately after we find him proving a Pope by a Father, then by a Schoolman, and last of all by the mere *vox populi*. Now, with his principles strictly carried out, he should have proved Pope by Pope, and by nothing less, (and how he would succeed in doing so our pages may perhaps afford some slight idea;) to prove a Pope by a Father is, in him, like proving S. Paul or S. John by S. Ignatius or S. Irenæus. In fact, there can be no need, in this case, to appeal even to Scripture itself, and Perrone's whole work is based on a fallacy. He should not have inquired whether the Pope *can* rule the doctrine, but whether he has done, or pleases to do so. In taking leave of Perrone, and the arguments he has brought forward, we cannot forbear calling to his attention the words addressed to him by Pius IX., and of which he seems not a little proud, 'Dum autem tibi, dilecte fili, debitas pro dono agimus gratias, te etiam atque etiam hortamur, ut majore usque alacritate tuas curas cogitationesque in iis potissimum conficiendis impendere pergas, quæ rei tum sacræ tum litterariæ usui et ornameto esse possint.'¹

But a graver question remains for us. Whilst the Church of Rome inscribes in the list of her doctrines, and celebrates among her festivals, the Immaculate Conception of any but Christ alone,

¹ Page 2.

and that on no better authority than the dictum of one or two of her Popes, what blame can there be to any National Church, or to any individual, for refusing to hold communion with her? How, too, can those primary questions of the infallibility and perfect unity of that Church and her Pontiffs maintain their ground in the face of Popes, not observing a proper œconomy, or a necessary silence, and, when the time has come, speaking out boldly, plainly, decisively, and once for all,—but abounding in doubts and hesitations, and falling into continual contradictions, both of themselves and of one another? And if these first principles fail, then, however important is the present question in itself, it may become still more so in its results; for it is on them alone, if on anything, that she can demand the submission of other Churches; and if, fairly tested by history, they are found utterly incapable of sustaining the weight that is placed on them, and proved to be simply a nullity—and yet she has no other ground on which to assail us or to deny the claim of the Church in England to be a part of the mystical body of Christ—it may well assure us that we have, in truth, a point of communion, in that Church, with the Apostles, and a position which can bear examination, even on its weakest points, far better than the Church of Rome, with all her boast and assumption of a peculiar infallibility and an unbroken unity, can bear inquiry on such a doctrine as that of the Immaculate Conception.

APPENDIX.

LITTLE OFFICE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

[The text is an exact copy of the Office as published by authority at Rome, in 1838. *Vide* *Cœleste Palmetum*, p. 243.]

Eja, mea labia, nunc annuntiate
Laudes et præconia Virginis beatæ.

- V. Domina, in adiutorium meum intende.
R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.
V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

From Septuagesima to Easter, instead of Alleluia, is said:

Laus tibi, Domine, Rex æternæ gloriæ.

HYMN.

Salve, mundi Domina,
Cœlorum Regina :
Salve, Virgo virginum,
Stella matutina.

Salve, plena gratia,
Clara luce divina :
Mundi in auxilium,
Domina, festina.

Ab æterno Dominus
Te præordinavit
Matrem unigeniti
Verbi, quo creavit

Terram, pontum, æthera :
Te pulchram ornavit
Sibi Sponsam, quæ in
Adam non peccavit. Amen.

V. Elegit eam Deus, et prælegit eam.
R. In tabernaculo suo habitare fecit eam.
V. Domina, exaudi orationem meam.
R. Et clamor meus ad te veniat.

Oremus.

Sancta Maria, Regina cœlorum, mater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et mundi Domina, quæ nullum derelinquis, et nullum despicias ; respice me, Domina, clementer oculo pietatis, et impetra mihi apud tuum dilectum Filium cunctorum veniam peccatorum : ut qui nunc tuam sanctam et *immaculatam* Conceptionem devoto affectu recolo, æternæ in futurum beatitudinis bravium capiam, ipso, quem virgo peperisti, donante Domino nostro Jesu Christo ; qui cum Patre et Sancto Spiritu vivit et regnat, in Trinitate perfecta Deus in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

V. Domina, exaudi orationem meam.
R. Et clamor meus ad te veniat.
V. Benedicamus Domino.
R. Deo gratias.
V. Fidelium animæ per misericordiam Dei requiescant in pace.
R. Amen.

AT PRIME.

V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.
R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.
V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, Virgo sapiens,
Domus Deo dicata,
Columna septemplici
Mensaque exornata.

Ab omni contagio
Mundi præservata :
Ante sancta in utero
Parentis, quam nata.

Tu, Mater viventium,
Et porta es Sanctorum :
Nova stella Jacob,
Domina Angelorum.

Zabulo terribilis
Acies castrorum :
Portus et refugium
Sis Christianorum. Amen.

V. Ipse creavit illam in Spiritu Sancto.
R. Et effudit illam inter omnia opera sua.
V. Domina, exaudi, &c. (*cum Oratione, ut supra.*)

AT TERCE.

V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.
R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.
V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, arca fœderis,
Thronus Salomonis,
Arcus pulcher ætheris,
Rubus visionis :

Virga frondens germinis :
Vellus Gedeonis :
Porta clausa numinis,
Favusque Samsonis.

Decebat tam nobilem
Natum, præcavere
Ab originali
Labe Matris Evæ

Almam, quam elegerat,
Genitricem vere,
Nulli prorsus sinens
Culpæ subiacere. Amen.

V. Ego in altissimis habito.

R. Et thronus meus in columna nubis.

V. Domina, exaudi, &c. (p. 422, cum Oratione, ut supra.)

AT SEXT.

V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.

R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.

V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, Virgo puerpera,
Templum Trinitatis;
Angelorum gaudium,
Cella puritatis:

Solamen mœrentium,
Hortus voluptatis:
Palma patientiæ,
Cedrus castitatis.

Terra es benedicta
Et sacerdotalis,
Sancta et immunis
Culpæ originalis.

Civitas altissimi,
Porta orientalis:
In te est omnis gratia,
Virgo singularis. Amen.

V. Sicut lilium inter spinas.

R. Sic amica mea inter filias Adæ.

V. Domina exaudi, &c. (p. 422, cum Oratione, ut supra.)

AT NONE.

V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.

R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.

V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, urbs refugii,
Turrisque munita
David, propugnaculis
Armisque insignita.

In Conceptione
Charitate ignita,
Draconis potestas
Est a te contrita.

O mulier fortis,
Et invicta Judith!
Pulchra Abisag virgo,
Verum fovens David!

Rachel curatorem
Ægypti gestavit:
Salvatorem mundi
Maria portavit. Amen.

V. Tota pulchra es, amica mea.

R. Et macula originalis nunquam fuit in te.

V. Domina, exaudi, &c. (p. 422, cum Oratione, ut supra.)

AT VESPER.

V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.

R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.

V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, horologium,
Quo retrogradiatur
Sol in decem lineis;
Verbum incarnatur.

Homo ut ab inferis
Ad summa attollatur,
Immensus ab Angelis
Paulo minoratur.

Solis hujus radiis
Maria coruscat;
Consurgens aurora
In conceptu micat.

Lilium inter spinas
Quæ serpentis conterat
Caput: pulchra ut luna
Errantes collustrat. Amen.

- V. Ego feci in cœlis, ut oriretur lumen indeficiens.
 R. Et quasi nebula texi omnem terram.
 V. Domina, exaudi, &c. (*p. 422, cum Oratione, ut supra.*)

AT COMPLINE.

- V. Convertat nos, Domina, tuis precibus placatus Jesus Christus Filius tuus.
 R. Et avertat iram suam a nobis.
 V. Domina, in adjutorium meum intende.
 R. Me de manu hostium potenter defende.
 V. Gloria Patri. Alleluia.

HYMN.

Salve, Virgo florens,	Per te, Mater gratiæ,
Mater illibata,	Dulcis spes reorum,
Regina clementiæ,	Fulgens stella maris,
Stellis coronata.	Portus naufragorum,
Super omnes Angelos	Patens cœli janua,
Pura, immaculata,	Salus infirmorum,
Atque ad regis dexteram	Videamus Regem
Stans veste deaurata.	In aula Sanctorum. Amen.

- V. Oleum effusum, Maria, nomen tuum.
 R. Servi tui dilexerunt te nimis.
 V. Domina, exaudi, &c. (*p. 422, cum Oratione, ut supra.*)

THE COMMENDATION.

Supplices offerimus	Ducas cursu prospero;
Tibi, Virgo pia,	Et in agonia
Hæc laudum præconia;	Tu nobis assiste,
Fac nos ut in via!	O dulcis Maria.

R. Deo gratias.

There is also a larger Office, (London, Richardson & Son, 1849;) and we beg our readers to observe, that whilst even Clement, in 1708, although certainly implying that the Conception in itself was Immaculate, only ventured to use that term of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. do not hesitate to apply it to the Conception. The language of the first of these Popes is 'festum Conceptionis Beatæ Mariæ Virginis immaculatæ;' that of the two last, 'Tuam sanctam et immaculatam Conceptionem recolo.'—Lesser Office, A.D. 1838. 'Immaculata Conceptio est hodie Sanctæ Mariæ Virginis.'—Greater Office, 1848. Moreover, the wide difference of language applied to the Blessed Virgin Mary by the Fathers from whom the homilies for that Festival are taken, S. Ambrose, S. Bernard, S. Chrysostom, S. John Damascenes, &c., and that used in the Office itself, is also very remarkable.

THE following list of authors who have treated of this subject may be found useful by those who wish to investigate the question for themselves.

S. Bernard.—Letter to the Canons of Lyons. Letter 174 (and Benedictine note), p. 169, &c. Vol. i. fol. Paris. 1719. And three Sermons on the Assumption. Ditto, p. 1001, &c.

Peter Lombard.—Book of Sentences, Book iii. Distinction 3. On which the chief commentators are—

Century 13.

Alexander of Hales (Franciscan.)—Summa Theologiæ, No. 2, Article 2.

Bonaventura, his pupil (Franciscan.)—Book iii. Dist. 3. Quest. 1.

Albertus Magnus (Dominican.)—Book iii. Dist. 3. Art. 3.

S. Thomas Aquinas, his pupil (Dominican).—On Book ii. of the Sentences, Dist. 31. Quest. 1. Art. 2; and Book iii. Quest. 1; and Summa Theologiæ, Quest. 27. Art. 1.

Century 14.

John Duns Scotus (Franciscan).—On Book iii. Dist. 3. Quest. 1. Scotus' doctrine on the particular question of the Immaculate Conception is much the same as those of the Schoolmen named above;—where he really does differ from them being, that he goes much further than they do in asserting the perfect Impeccability of the Blessed Virgin Mary, both as to mortal and venial sin: they all allowing with S. Chrysostom, or rather not venturing to deny, the possibility of at least the latter.

John Montesonus.—Theses; in Alexander Natalis, vol. xx. 8vo. Paris. A.D. 1684.

Bulæus.—History of the University of Paris. Tom. ii.

Mabillon.—Annales Benedictini. Tom. vi.

Wadding (Franciscan).—Annales Minorum, Centuries 13 and 14.

Alexander Natalis (Dominican).—Centuries 13 and 14.

Launoy (Jansenist).—Two Prescriptions, pp. 43, in vol. i. of his Works. Folio, Cologne. 1731.

Calixtus, Ulrici, 4to. Helmstadt, A.D. 1696. These, except Wadding, are all strenuous opposers of the Immaculate Conception.

Corpus Juris Canonici.

Bullarium of Cherubini, Tom. ii. iii. vi., and that of Rome, A.D. 1735, which is more copious. In these we find the rules of the following Popes on the question :—

Sixtus IV.'s Constitutions 'Cum præcelsa,' A.D. 1476–7, and 'Grave nimis,' 1483. These are in the Corpus Juris Canonici, and they were renewed by the Council of Trent at the end of its 'Decretum de Originali Peccato.'

Pius V.—Bull 'Quod a nobis,' 1568, and 'Super speculum,' 1570.

Paul V.—'Regis Pacifici,' 1616.

Gregory XV.—'Sanctissimus Dominus Noster,' 1622.

Alexander VII.—'Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum,' 1661.

These five Popes and the Council of Trent left the question altogether undecided; but soon after Alexander VII., we find Clement XI., in his Bull, 'Commissi nobis,' ordering that the festival of the Immaculate Conception (properly so called) should be celebrated every year.

The works of Gonzalez and Perrone, both Jesuits, are remarkable as showing a fatal difference of *first principles*, on the doctrine, between their respective authors.

And lastly, Mr. Morris, late Fellow of Exeter College, has lately published two volumes octavo, under the title of 'Jesus, the Son of Mary,' the second of which treats, among other things, of the Immaculate Conception: but his work differs in no respect from others on the same side of the question, either in the kind of proofs adduced by him for the doctrine, or in their cogency of application.

The early Fathers of the Church, who contended firstly for our Lord's true Humanity, and afterwards for the doctrine of Grace—S. Irenæus and Tertullian against the Gnostics; S. Athanasius, the two Gregories, of Nazianzum and Nyssa, with S. Basil, against Apollinaris; and S. Augustin against Julian and the Pelagians—may be useful as affording an *indirect* evidence against the modern Romish doctrine, and indeed even that of S. Bernard, by showing that they included the Blessed Virgin Mary in the penalty of Adam's fall, *by nature*, and did not exclude her from it through her *personal privilege* as the mother of our Lord.

☛ A copious list of authorities, in addition to the above, will be found in the Bibliotheca of Walchjusz.

ART. IV.—*Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli*. 3 vols. London: Bentley. 1852.

A POPULAR novelist has satirised with some asperity the American love of celebrities, and the habit of each little Transatlantic circle to attribute to its favourites a world-wide fame, so that the country may be said to abound, nay, even to swarm, with 'remarkable' and 'distinguished' men. The present volumes furnish us with a portrait of a remarkable American woman, and so really distinguished for certain gifts, and for their high appreciation by her countrymen, and for the part she took in Italian politics, that we doubt not her name is already familiar to some congenial English coteries, though we take no shame to ourselves that hitherto it has been no household word with us, nor, we would venture to guess, with most of our readers. We never heard of Margaret Fuller, nor of her Italian development as Margaret Fuller Ossoli, till these volumes placed her before us, with all the skill at portraying character three American writers, of some eminence in their peculiar school, could command. Mr. J. Freeman Clarke, Mr. Emerson, Mr. W. E. Channing, assisted by slighter sketches from other hands, have succeeded in drawing a portrait, in giving us an idea, in placing a very singular woman distinctly enough before us. As the muse, the priestess, and, *we* would add, the victim, of their system of philosophy, she called for this at their hands; and it has been a work of love to them all. That philosophy which would take the world by storm, as a new discovery,—a sign of progress and emancipation,—a development of the refined and purified human reason,—but to which Bacon assigns a much earlier origin, placing it at the head and beginning, indeed, of all systems which have misled mankind, where he says, (in defining the nature of that desire for knowledge which led to the Fall,) that 'an aspiring desire to attain to that part of moral knowledge which defineth of good and evil, whereby to dispute God's commandments, and not to depend upon the revelation of His will, was 'the original temptation.' A 'desire' which characterises all the writers worshipped by Margaret Fuller, and forming her mind; and the distinguishing feature of her own philosophic system. Where persons renounce creeds, and deem themselves superior to forms, and estimate religion in proportion to its vagueness,—holding it the purer for owning no object, and the deeper for having no base,—they are necessarily thrown back upon their own and kindred minds for something definite to extol and care for. Their own speculations, their own thoughts, become the true objects of their devotion, from the necessity which exists

in our nature for something positive to rest upon; and thus we find in this school of philosophy a universal tendency to hero-worship. Each professor of it sets up a pantheon of his own, as a sort of *locum tenens* of the evanescent deity which they profess to acknowledge, but which, 'peradventure sleeping, or on a journey,' eludes the mind's grasp. And as Lord Bacon has furnished us with a definition of the motive principle of the system, so does he aptly describe the consequences of this worship of the human reason, from whatever cause. 'Another error,' he says, 'hath proceeded from too great reverence, and a kind of adoration of the mind and understanding of man; by means whereof men have withdrawn themselves too much from the contemplation of nature and the observations of experience, and have tumbled up and down in their own reasons and conceits; . . . for they disdain to spell, and so, by degrees, to read, in the volume of God's works, and contrariwise, by continual meditation and agitation of wit, do urge, and, as it were, invoke, their own spirits to divine and give oracles unto them, whereby they are deservedly deluded.' The present volumes furnish one out of many painful illustrations of the truth of this picture—this invocation of the spirit to divine and give oracles, and this 'tumbling up and down' of the reason and conceit, and the consequent delusion. It would be easy enough to draw a simply repulsive picture of this 'Yankee Corinne,' with plain features, nasal tones, arrogant manners; this egotistical, self-confident, clever woman; this socialistic, transcendental unbeliever; this despiser of social order; this contemner of creeds; this shallow scorner of deep truths: it would be easy, we say, and every word might be vouched for by testimony of her friends recorded in these volumes; but it would not be true, for it would not be the whole truth. It would not be fair to represent her as, in fact, repulsive, for such she was not to those who knew her; and we can quite understand *why* she was not, though this catalogue of repelling qualities would justly lead all wise people to keep out of the sphere of her attractions.

Women are no originators of systems: we may pity, therefore, while we blame, this female genius, so early caught in the snare of Rousseau and Goethe, and so many other masculine offenders, for whom her education and unduly developed intellect made her so ready a prey. But instead of generalising, for which we have little space, we will present our readers with a slight sketch of Margaret's life and thoughts, which the present work, in spite of the bias of the writers, very fairly presents us with.

She was born in 1810 at Cambridge Port, Massachusetts, and was the daughter of Timothy Fuller, a lawyer and politician—

himself a scholar, and, according to the place and time, a good one, but never winning his daughter's intellectual respect, and, indeed, scarcely deserving it, as his early system of education cost her dear. Seeing her powers, he chose to educate her himself, and seems to have quite deliberately set to work to make her a prodigy. He overtasked her mind by the nature and quantity of the work he gave it; and, to make matters worse, being engaged in other avocations all day, put off his little daughter's lessons till late in the evening, and sometimes till really late at night—a system of child-murder which, we hope, could hardly find a parallel or example in the present day. She constantly went to bed several hours too late, and was so haunted when she lay down in it by nightmare, spectral illusions, and somnambulism, that sometimes she could scarcely be persuaded to go to bed at all. Thus, she complains, the harmonious development and growth of her bodily powers was checked, and the seeds of subsequent headache, weakness, and nervous affections of all kinds laid up for her whole life. This was her father's fault; but one of her friends drops a curious hint of a youthful weakness of her own, a taste for tight-lacing, strangely at variance with the masculine sense attributed to this 'large-brained woman,' which may have helped on these engrafted infirmities of constitution. She did not go mad, she says, under this strange management. 'Her mind had too much strength to be crushed,' and she acquired in her childhood sufficient accurate knowledge of Latin and its classics, and some Greek. Nature had given her a taste for the beautiful, which her 'ugly' home and her father's utilitarian views made it difficult for her to indulge; but there was a row of elms and a cultivated garden to feed these instincts, and out of the window of her father's library (within which she was introduced at the same time and at a very early age to Shakspeare, Cervantes, and Molière) she could watch the setting sun.

Full of what she took for Roman and Shakspearian visions of majesty and beauty, the poor child acquired a great contempt for such homely specimens of human nature as a New England village supplied her with. She owns to a profound 'odious' contempt for all her neighbours, more especially when she beheld them all assembled together in the village church. America is so destitute of antiquities, heroic traditions, and all that feeds the romance of childhood, that we may sympathise a little with even the uncivil consequences of unsatisfied yearnings for them, and enter besides into the delight with which she found a temporary contentment. We are not accustomed to see *romance* in elegance and propriety of deportment, in *cultivation* in fact; but to a child's imagination, debarred from acquaintance with them, and asso-

ciating these qualities with the old world and its histories, we can quite understand how a well-bred English lady, beheld for the first time, should be surrounded with the sort of halo with which our infancy invested the heroines of chivalry or the princesses of fairy land. She was in the said village church when,

‘As my eye was ranging about with its accustomed coldness, and the proudly foolish sense of being in a shroud of thoughts that were not their thoughts, it was arrested by a face most fair, and well-known, as it seemed at first glance—for surely I had met her before, and waited for her long. But soon I saw that she was a new apparition foreign to that scene, if not to me. Her dress—the arrangement of her hair, which had the graceful pliancy of races highly cultivated for long,—the intelligent and full picture of her eye, whose reserve was in its self-possession, not in timidity—all combined to make up a whole impression, which, though too young to understand, I was well prepared to feel. . . . She was an English lady, who, by a singular chance, was cast upon this region for a few months. Elegant and captivating, her every look and gesture was tuned to a different pitch from anything I had ever known. She was in various ways “accomplished,” as it is called, though to what degree I cannot now judge. She painted in oils;—I had never before seen any one use the brush, and days would not have been too long for me to watch the pictures growing beneath her hand. She played the harp: and its tones are still to me the heralds of the promised land I saw before me then. She rose, she looked, she spoke; and the gentle swaying motion she made, all through life has gladdened memory, as the stream does the woods and meadows. . . . Her mind was sufficiently unoccupied to delight in my warm devotion. She could not know what it was to me, but the light cast by the flame through so delicate a vase cheered and charmed her. All who saw her admired her in their way; but she would lightly turn her head from their hard or oppressive looks, and fix a glance of full-eyed sweetness on the child, who, from a distance, watched all her looks and motions. She did not say much to me—not much to any one; she spoke in her whole being rather than by chosen words. . . . We walked in the fields, alone. Though others were present, her eyes were gliding over all the field and plain for the objects of beauty to which she was of kin. She was not cold to her seeming companions; a sweet courtesy satisfied them, but it hung about her like her mantle that she wore without thinking of it; her thoughts were free, for these civilized beings can live really two lives at the same moment. With them she seemed to be, but her hand was given to the child at her side; others did not observe me, but to her I was the only human presence. Like a guardian spirit she led me through the fields and groves, and every tree, every bird greeted me, and said, what I felt, “She is the first angel of your life.”’—Vol. i. pp. 34—38.

This is a pretty picture and a youthful enthusiasm well described, and it is only justice to Margaret, who issued in so terribly strong-minded a woman, to explain that she differed through life from her strong-minded sisterhood in this one particular,—in full sympathy with and love for the society of her own sex. She liked her girlish companions because they were beautiful, though she was plain. She had a prodigious number of female friendships; she laid herself out to emancipate the female mind from its trammels, real or more likely fancied; and she

brought out all her store of fascinations in their company, and for their sake alone—to win them, to make an impression upon them; and she was rewarded by a very enthusiastic lover-like devotion from all the most admired and courted beauties of her acquaintance.

About this time she was sent to school at Boston, to Dr. Park's seminary for young ladies. She has given, under a feigned name, her confessions, for so they must be called, of this somewhat unsatisfactory period of her life, when she fell into the temporary sin of mischief-making and tale-bearing amongst her school-fellows, out of revenge for tricks and satire which her peculiarities brought upon her. She must have been a strange wild creature, full of genius, and excitable to extravagance, having a propensity to *spin* like a dancing dervish; at the end of a whirl being inspired to great feats of declamation and acting, 'sometimes stimulating her to convulse the hearers with laughter, 'sometimes to melt them to tears.' She had a whimsical turn for eccentricities of dress and theatrical draperies, and on occasion of some private theatricals was so taken by the effect of rouge on her good looks, that she persisted in adopting it as a practice, which tells rather oddly for the discipline of Dr. Park's establishment. Her school-fellows, however, broke her of this fancy by a harmless practical joke as it might have appeared, but which so wounded the pride of our heroine's nature that it nearly cost her her life. Highly instructed, feared, and loved, and altogether wondered at, she left school at sixteen, to enter again into society, in which she had previously taken a woman's stand; for we are told at thirteen she was so precocious in physical and mental development, that she passed for eighteen or twenty, and she had her place in society as a lady full-grown. At sixteen she was an established star in her own circle:—

'In our evening reunions,' says the Rev. F. H. Hedge, 'of this and a few subsequent years, she was always conspicuous by the brilliancy of her wit, which needed but little provocation to break forth in exuberant sallies, that drew around her a knot of listeners, and made her the central attraction of the hour. Rarely did she enter a company in which she was not a prominent object.'—Vol. i. p. 19.

Elsewhere he speaks of her early tendency to sarcasm:—

'As she advanced in life, she learned to control that tendency to sarcasm,—that disposition to "quiz,"—which was then somewhat excessive. It frightened shy young people from her presence, and made her, for a while, notoriously unpopular with the ladies of her circle.'—Vol. i. p. 116.

'I have spoken of her conversational talent. It continued to develop in these years, and was certainly her most decided gift. One could form no adequate idea of her ability without hearing her converse. She did many things well, but nothing so well as she talked. It is the opinion of all her friends that her writings do her very imperfect justice. For some reason or other, she could never deliver herself in print as she did with her

lips. She required the stimulus of attentive ears and answering eyes to bring out all her power. She must have her auditory about her. Her conversation, as it was then, I have seldom heard equalled. It was not so much attractive as commanding. Though remarkably fluent and select, it was neither fluency, nor choice diction, nor wit, nor sentiment, that gave it its peculiar power; but accuracy of statement, keen discrimination, and a certain weight of judgment which contrasted strongly and charmingly with the youth and sex of the speaker. I do not remember that the vulgar charge of talking "like a book" was ever fastened upon her, although, by her precision, she might seem to have incurred it. The fact was, her speech, though finished and true as the most deliberate rhetoric of the pen, had always an air of spontaneity which made it seem the grace of the moment,—the result of some organic provision that made finished sentences as natural to her as blundering and hesitation are to most of us. With a little more imagination, she would have made an excellent improvisatrice.'—Vol. i. pp. 120, 121.

It was with this dangerous gift, with a singular power of seizing at once and using as if it had long been her own every new thought and idea that books or other minds were presenting to her, that Margaret was at this time forming her opinions and filling her head with all the theories—French and German—that an insatiable love of reading and a resolute industry could find time for. She was in a perpetual excitement of success, fed by the consciousness of possessing high intellect, and appropriating with delight every external influence that ministered to her diseased mental activity. 'Blessed be the early days,' she says somewhere, 'when I sat at the feet of Rousseau, prophet 'sad and stately as any of Jewry! Every 'onward movement of the age, every downward step into the solemn depths 'of my own soul, recalls thy oracles, O Jean Jacques!' But we do not intend to inflict many of these rhapsodies upon our readers. The fearful picture of a girl of 16 or 20 for ever reading books which some kind friend should have withheld from her, for ever talking on subjects she should not have been encouraged to open her lips upon, and urged on by general attention and admiration which might have turned older heads than hers, is one more for sorrow than anger. As far as we can gather, her father, proud of her talents, left her very much to her own discretion. Once we find him forbidding her when a child to read plays and romances on Sunday; and a few years later she considers it a great grievance that she must go to church—whatever this 'Church' might have been—on Thanksgiving Day (she had quite discontinued her Sunday attendance), or seriously offend her father. Here his authority seems to have stopped: and yet his mother was apparently of the more rigid Puritan school. She describes her on one occasion as a venerable old lady always reading the 'Saints' Rest.' Perhaps these gradations of faith, 'fine by degrees and

beautifully less,' may not be uncommon. In thinking of a woman, we always like to have some idea of her personal appearance. Mr. Hedge is the most favourable reporter on this head:—

'When I recal her personal appearance then (at 13), and for ten or twelve years subsequent to this, I have the idea of a blooming girl of a florid complexion and vigorous health, with a tendency to robustness, of which she was painfully conscious, and which, with little regard to hygienic principles, she endeavoured to suppress or conceal, thereby preparing for herself much future suffering. With no pretensions to beauty then, or at any time, her face was one that attracted, that awakened a lively interest, that made one desirous of a nearer acquaintance. It was a face that fascinated, without satisfying. . . . I said she had no pretensions to beauty. Yet she was not plain. She escaped the reproach of positive plainness, by her blond and abundant hair, by her excellent teeth, by her sparkling, dancing, busy eyes, which, though usually half closed from near-sightedness, shot piercing glances at those with whom she conversed, and, most of all, by the very peculiar and graceful carriage of her head and neck, which all who knew her will remember as the most characteristic trait in her personal appearance.'—Vol. i. pp. 115, 116.

Mr. Hedge is the friend of her youth; he introduced her to Mr. Emerson when she was 26, who has also given his impression. Mr. Emerson when in the vein can rhapsodise with any man; but this has not been his line in these pages, in which they differ favourably from other portions of the work. On the contrary, they are marked by a straightforward, rather amusing candour. He takes the bull by the horns, and while he wishes to make us end with an extraordinary admiration and veneration for Margaret, he does not shrink from the honest task of making the reader a sharer in all the difficulties which her friends had to encounter in their first acquaintance. He says:—

'I still remember the first half-hour of Margaret's conversation. She was then 26 years old. She had a face and frame that would indicate fulness and tenacity of life. She was rather under the middle height; her complexion was fair, with strong fair hair. She was then, as always, carefully and becomingly dressed, and of ladylike self-possession. For the rest, her appearance had nothing prepossessing. Her extreme plainness,—a trick of incessantly opening and shutting her eyelids,—the nasal tone of her voice,—all repelled; and I said to myself, we shall never get far. It is to be said, that Margaret made a disagreeable first impression on most persons, including those who became afterwards her best friends, to such an extreme that they did not wish to be in the same room with her. This was partly the effect of her manners, which expressed an overweening sense of power, and slight esteem for others, and partly the prejudice of her fame. She had a dangerous reputation for satire, in addition to her great scholarship. The men thought she carried too many guns, and the women did not like one who despised them. I believe I fancied her too much interested in personal history; and her talk was a comedy in which dramatic justice was done to everybody's foibles. I remember that she made me laugh more than I liked; for I was, at that time, an eager scholar of ethics, and had tasted the sweets of solitude and stoicism, and I found

something profane in the hours of amusing gossip into which she drew me, and when I returned to my library had much to think of the crackling of thorns under a pot.'—Vol. i. pp. 268, 269.

On the arrogance which characterised her he is equally candid :—

'Margaret at first astonished and repelled us by a complacency that seemed the most assured since the days of Scaliger. She spoke, in the quietest manner, of the girls she had formed, the young men who owed everything to her, the fine companions she had long ago exhausted. In the coolest way, she said to her friends, "I now know all the people worth knowing in America, and I find no intellect comparable to my own." In vain, on one occasion, I professed my reverence for a youth of genius, and my curiosity in his future,—"O no, she was intimate with his mind, and I spoiled him, by overrating him." Meantime, we knew that she neither had seen, nor would see, his subtle superiorities.'—Vol. ii. pp. 1, 2.

He then relates that she herself had from the beginning of life idealized herself as a sovereign, and had felt herself in childhood so intellectually superior to all around her, that she had believed herself not her parents' child, but an European princess confided to their care; and in a letter to a female friend she says, 'I take my natural position always: and the more I see, the more I feel that it is regal. Without throne, sceptre, or guards, still a queen.'

'It is certain,' says Mr. Emerson, 'that Margaret occasionally let slip, with all the innocence imaginable, some phrase betraying the presence of a rather mountainous ME, in a way to surprise those who knew her good sense. She could say, as if she were stating a scientific fact, in enumerating the merits of somebody, "He appreciates me." . . . I remember she once said to me, what I heard as a mere statement of fact, and nowise as unbecoming, that "no man gave such invitation to her mind as to tempt her to a full expression; that she felt a power to enrich her thought with such wealth and variety of embellishment as would, no doubt, be tedious to such as she conversed with."—Vol. ii. pp. 3, 4.

On the subject of education, she records in her journal that she had said :—

'I am really old on this subject. In near eight years' experience, I have learned as much as others would in eighty, from my great talent at explanation, tact in the use of means, and immediate and invariable power over the minds of my pupils.'—Vol. ii. pp. 4, 5.

Again :—

'With the intellect I always have, always shall, overcome; but that is not the half of the work. The life, the life! O, my God! shall the life never be sweet?'—Vol. ii. p. 5.

Elsewhere we find the following *naïve* confession, and subsequent aspiration :—

'My fault is that I think, I feel *too much*. O that my friends would teach me that "simple art of not too much!" How can I expect them to bear the ceaseless eloquence of my nature!'—Vol. ii. p. 300.

And again, speaking of some friend whom she had loved,—

'She loved me, too, though not so much, because her nature was "less high, less grave, less large, less deep." '—Vol. ii. p. 71.

Our readers must bear in mind that Margaret was not a Christian, of which we shall shortly proceed to give proofs enough in her own words. She is, therefore, alien from us; but the fact must not tell both ways. We must not say she was proud and a heathen, but 'she was not a Christian, therefore, she was proud.' There are touches here and there, in spite of the prodigious 'swelling' of this self-esteem, confessions, which might be germs of true humility in the converted and renewed heart. It is a favourite notion—taken for granted, indeed, in our youth—that great minds,—minds of power, genius, influence,—minds that have weight over ourselves,—whose works tell upon their fellow-men,—whom to know is a point in most men's history, are, by virtue of their greatness, humble. Self-esteem is little. We despise it when we detect it. It is grand to forget self; to sparkle, to irradiate, to overflow, to dazzle, delight, inform others, and be all the while unconscious, simple, natural like other men. It *is* grand, but it is the rarest of all intellectual phenomena. Deep men, men of genius and of poetic inspiration, have the gift to know their gift just as consciously 'as maidens that are young and fair.' Humility is a Christian grace, and a very difficult one to maintain under the consciousness of a superior intellect; and we fear this poor Margaret's tumid unblushing self-estimation is but a caricature of many a higher genius's private hidden musings. Such examples of the weakness of our nature have a higher use than simply to be laughed at; they may teach other men under the same temptations a practical lesson.

Mr. Emerson has not shrunk from betraying his friend's imperfections. It is certainly remarkable that with these qualities so conspicuous, upon a first acquaintance she should yet have won such a strong hold over the hearts and affections of so many as we must believe that she did. This is, indeed, the strange power of genius, the power to win the love of other minds in spite of themselves; so that we are assured none could resist her fascination, when she chose to exert it. And, in truth, she had a very wide sympathy with her fellows, and an intense curiosity and desire to be acquainted with them,—to know each mind that came in her way,—to be beloved by it,—to be necessary, in a certain sense, to it. It was an attraction that few could resist, and a quality as precious as it is rare, we would add, with a professed fine talker.

'Margaret possessed,' says Mr. J. F. Clarke, 'in a greater degree than any person I ever knew, the power of so magnetizing others, when she wished, by the power of her mind, that they would lay open to her all the secrets of their nature. She had an infinite curiosity to know individuals,—not the vulgar curiosity which seeks to find out the circumstances of their outward lives, but that which longs to understand the inward springs of thought and action in their souls. This desire and power both rested on a profound conviction of her mind in the individuality of every human being.'—Vol. i. pp. 78, 79.

Another, remembering, years after, the effect of her conversation on himself, says:—

"No one ever came so near. Her mood applied itself to the mood of her companion, point to point, in the most limber, sinuous, vital way, and drew out the most extraordinary narratives; yet she had a light sort of laugh, when all was said, as if she thought she could live over that revelation. And this sufficient sympathy she had for all persons indifferently,—for lovers, for artists, and beautiful maids, and ambitious young statesmen, and for old aunts, and coach-travellers. Ah! she applied herself to the mood of her companion, as the sponge applies itself to water." The description tallies well enough with my observation. I remember she found, one day, at my house, her old friend Mr. —, sitting with me. She looked at him attentively, and hardly seemed to know him. In the afternoon, he invited her to go with him to Cambridge. The next day she said to me, "You fancy that you know —. It is too absurd; you have never seen him. When I found him here, sitting like a statue, I was alarmed, and thought him ill. You sit with courteous, *unconfiding* smile, and suppose him to be a mere man of talent. He is so with you. But the moment I was alone with him, he was another creature; his manner, so glassy and elaborate before, was full of soul, and the tones of his voice entirely different." And I have no doubt that she saw expressions, heard tones, and received thoughts from her companions, which no one else ever saw or heard from the same parties, and that her praise of her friends, which seemed exaggerated, was her exact impression. We were all obliged to recal Margaret's testimony, when we found we were sad blockheads to other people."—Vol. ii. pp. 112, 113.

This sympathy is creditable in a professed talker, and we need hardly wonder at her popularity if she used her gifts not so much for display, as for the arousing and developing the minds she came in contact with. 'She made her companion,' says one, 'think more of himself and of common life than of herself.' Perhaps there is no social pleasure more exquisite than the sense of being for a moment lifted above our actual selves by some vigorous and congenial mind. Margaret often, it is true, lifted her friends into very prejudicial flights; but this was the fault, not of her natural gift of sympathy, but of her pernicious opinions. She was the depository of innumerable love stories. Every one told her, as it were, by a sort of fascination, the romance of his life. Even the housemaids, after she had been visiting in a house for a day or two, were led to reveal their humble experience; and coach travellers the same. She is complimented by her biographers for her fidelity in

keeping all these secrets; and though her talk was of people, and she excelled in personal histories, she never betrayed a confidence. The present work, at least, betrays none. One exception proves the rule, and for its brevity we will give this one specimen of a Yankee courtship:—

‘This afternoon we met Mr. — in his wood; and he sat down and told us the story of his life, his courtship, and painted the portraits of his father and mother with most amusing *naïveté*. He said:—“How do you think I offered myself? I never had told Miss — that I loved her; never told her she was handsome; and I went to her, and said, ‘Miss —, I’ve come to offer myself; but first I’ll give you my character. I’m very poor; you’ll have to work: I’m very cross and irascible; you’ll have everything to bear: and I’ve liked many other pretty girls. Now what do you say?’ and she said, ‘I’ll have you:’ and she’s been everything to me.”’—Vol. ii. p. 114.

She was remarkable, too, for a very resolute line of truth and candour towards her friends. She could confound and yet not alienate persons by the severity with which she would tell them their faults, of which, if our space allowed, we would give some instances. Mr. Emerson dwells on what he calls her aggressive truth,—her power of dealing with falsehood in a decisive way,—of setting it down, so that people were afraid to be false before her. ‘In great and in small matters, she was a woman of her word, and gave those who conversed with her the unspeakable comfort that flows from plain dealing.’

But now, to leave for a time the more cheerful view of a remarkable character. Let us turn to the principles which influenced and guided it. There can hardly be anything more melancholy than the picture of one mind, especially if that mind be a woman’s, which these separate portraits show us. In all the intellectual tumult and unwholesome activity in which Margaret and her friends sustained and encouraged one another, there is so little to rest upon, so little to *her*, we are glad to say, of solid satisfaction. She never knew what she lacked; perhaps she refused to see, but there is always a sense of want increasing and darkening her path the further she proceeds upon it, but never apparently issuing into even the faintest dawn of a clearer day. We must put together some specimens of her mind on this subject:—

‘Though I reverence,’ she says, ‘all religions as necessary to the happiness of man, I am yet ignorant of the religion of Revelation.’—Vol. i. p. 177.

‘Describing,’ says Mr. J. F. Clarke, ‘a conversation in relation to Christianity with a friend of strong mind, who told her he had found in this religion a home for his best and deepest thoughts, she says, “Ah, what a pleasure to meet with such a daring, yet realizing mind as his!” but her catholic taste found satisfaction in intercourse with persons quite different from herself.’—Vol. i. pp. 134, 135.

At another time we find her using a less declared tone,

as where she says in the following passage, descriptive of the society she lived in, and of her *want* at this time,—

‘My object is to examine thoroughly, as far as my time and abilities will permit, the evidences of the Christian religion. I have endeavoured to get rid of this task as much and as long as possible; to be content with superficial notions, and, if I may so express it, to adopt religion as a matter of taste. But I meet with infidels very often; two or three of my particular friends are deists; and their arguments, with distressing sceptical notions of my own, are haunting me for ever. I must satisfy myself; and having once begun, I shall go on as far as I can. My mind often swells with thoughts on these subjects, which I long to pour out on some person of superior calmness and strength, and fortunate in more accurate knowledge.’—Vol. i. pp. 196, 197.

The following deliberate opinion on a special providence will often recur to the reader of these volumes as accounting for the melancholy, and sense of failure, which are conspicuous in her reviews of her life. She really was without this belief. She talks of Destiny and Fate, contending with her and being against her, in a way often to make us realize what it is not to be a Christian:—

‘Although I do not believe in a Special Providence regulating outward events, and could not reconcile such a belief with what I have seen of life, I do not the less believe in the paternal government of a Deity.’—Vol. i. p. 260.

In her journal we meet with the following curious announcement:—

‘*Sunday, July 1838.*—I partook for the first time of the Lord’s Supper. I had often wished to do so, but had not been able to find a Clergyman, —from whom I could be willing to receive it,—willing to admit me on my own terms.’—Vol. i. p. 263.

What these terms were she does not explain, but she goes on highly to compliment—and we dare say not without good reason—the *liberality* of the ‘Clergyman,’ Mr. H——, on this occasion. Perhaps the following description of a young lady does not sound so strangely in America as it would with us, where Mr. Emerson says:—

‘She had had a circle of young women who were devoted to her, and who had described her “as a wonder of intellect, who had yet no religion.”’—Vol. i. p. 272.

This would by no means be her own definition of herself—she thought she had a great deal of religion; we rather say she had no Christianity. The following gives a singular view of this sense of emptiness which she could not but be aware of in herself. We must do her the justice to say that she is never satisfied with the state of things she voluntarily chose,—not so satisfied with it as those who thought with her.

‘It is true, the present deadness and emptiness summon us to turn our thoughts in that direction (“faithful solitary intentness of spirit”). Being

now without any positive form of religion, any unattractive symbols, or mysterious rites, we are in the less danger of stopping at surfaces. . . . And when I see how little there is to impede and bewilder us, I cannot but accept,—should it be for many years,—the forlornness, the want of fit expression, the darkness as to what is to be expressed even, that characterise our time. But I do not, therefore, as some of our friends do, believe that it will be always so.'—Vol. ii. p. 280.

In her 'credo,' she desires not to be profane in her mention of the one great object of Christian faith; and says, 'Few believe more in His history than myself, and it is very dear to me;' and again, 'I believe in my own way, in the long preparation of His coming;' and concludes thus liberally:—

'I will not loathe sects, persuasions, systems, though I cannot abide in them one moment, for I see that by most men they are still needed. To them their banners, their tents; let them be fireworshippers, platonists, Christians; let them live in the shadow of past revelations.'—Vol. ii. p. 292.

Along with this scepticism she had a great deal of superstition—she had notions of Dæmoniacal influence in a sense of her own, or rather of Goethe's, and imagines herself to have an evil genius, who often thwarts her plans and hinders her doing her best,—her *intellectual* best, it should be understood. However, at another time she takes an opposite line, and complains that 'the Dæmons are not busy enough at the births of most men.' And elsewhere we find this profane rhapsody, in complaining that friendship will not do for her what God alone can: 'Give an answer to my questions, Dæmon! Give a *rock* for my feet.'

It must be owned that Margaret's own musings and reflections are too much tinctured by such flights as these,—are too wild, visionary, and marked by the language of her school, to sustain the character for sense and reason which her biographers claim for her: feeling a sort of interest in her we are often ashamed of them, apart from the errors which lie at the bottom, and solely for the heady exaltation with which they are expressed. Mr. Emerson is not without consciousness of these faults in others, nor unwilling to admit them in her case. Yet some excuse for want of reason may be found for a mind with religious instincts such as she had, yet without an object to anchor them upon. She wanted a guide, but was too arrogant, and perhaps, too, not well circumstanced to find one; and so she invoked her own spirit to give oracles, and to divine on the nearest model of the Pythoness that her genius could suggest.

Yet all the while, in her own course of action, Margaret was practical, and acted up with some severity of principle to her own ideas of duty. When her father died, leaving his family but ill provided for, she resolutely renounced cherished schemes to devote herself to the comfort and support of her mother and the younger members of her family. It had long been arranged

that she should visit Europe, a plan which she had thought necessary for the full education and development of her mind, yet she steadily resisted even the entreaties of her mother, that she should apply her share of her father's property for this purpose, and remained at home, devoting herself with energy and success to practical business, for which she had the greatest natural distaste. She began in a sensible manner to make use of her talents, persevered for some years in teaching, and really succeeded in all she undertook. She was kind and generous too, and almost too liberal of her hard-earned dollars, bestowing them sometimes, from impulses of compassion, on undeserving objects; bearing with a very magnanimous resignation the failure of her good intentions. Her own conduct, too, from what we can learn, was without reproach, which, though slight praise in itself, should yet be recorded of one whose ideas of morality were founded on another principle altogether from God's commandments. A great many of the people she admired and accepted as teachers led bad lives, especially the French and German illuminati, male and female, who had formed and fed her mind. She has an amusing, though truly odious phraseology towards their outrages of morality and decency, and calls them *obstructions*. 'Why am I to love my friend the less,' she asks, 'for any obstruction in his life?' And again, where, in opposition to the rule of judging men by their fruits, she makes her own judgment her sole guide:—'Great, and even *fatal* errors (so far as this life is concerned) could not destroy any friendship for one in whom I am sure of the kernel of nobleness.' All the world knows what 'obstructions' have impeded the life of George Sand. All her works had long been prime favourites with Margaret, and so when she at length visits Europe, she goes to see her in Paris, and passes over her sins with a very revolting indifference. She is struck at first sight with the *goodness* that pervaded her expression, and thus speculates upon her life:—

'To me the truth seems to be this. She has that purity in her soul, for she knows well how to love and prize its beauty; but she herself is quite another sort of person. She needs no defence, but only to be understood, for she has bravely acted out her nature, and always with good intentions.'
—Vol. iii. p. 115.

We need not pursue this disgraceful subject with her; but this it is to be one of the 'emancipated women.' Of course, Margaret had strong views on the rights of women. She was a great disdainer of the ordinary restrictions of society, and addresses her gentleman friends with a very masterly disregard of customary reserves. Perhaps we cannot wonder at Mr. Freeman Clarke for publishing fragments of letters from a young lady of three-and-twenty, so highly flattering to his

self-love. She addresses Mr. Emerson as 'My best one,' which, as Mrs. Emerson did not object to, neither do we; and is particular to allow no difference of expression to distinguish the sex of her correspondent. But underneath all these mannish airs poor Margaret hides a woman's heart. She realizes her own deficiencies for inspiring an exclusive affection. She feels her want of beauty. Writing in spring-time, she says, 'When all things are blossoming, it seems strange 'not to blossom too: man is the slowest aloe, and I am such 'a shabby plant, of such coarse tissue. I hate not to be beautiful, when all around is so,' (vol. ii. p. 83;) and again hints at the pains of a disposition that requires refined tenderness, 'without charms to inspire it.' She knew all the while that there was no risk or danger of these gentlemen changing into lovers. In the midst of innumerable friendships with all persons and degrees, countless confidences, and the most penetrating intimacies, she saw quite clearly that 'none loved her best,' and she felt it keenly. It finds no unmaidenly expression in her more private written thoughts, where we see her excited, restless intellect longing for rest, and quite weary of the overwork with which she taxes it. She considered the two trials of her life, obstructions to her genius, and loneliness of heart. 'No one loves me,' she says, 'but I love many a good deal.' She longed, as all must, to be cared for, not for her intellect, but for herself, and on this account she intensely valued the love of children, and brought out all her fascinations to amuse them, and make herself necessary to them. She had, moreover, at the bottom, some perception of the limitation of her own powers; and now and then we find her habitual arrogance pleasantly redeemed by some flowers of unlooked-for humility. For example, she knows herself bounded by a woman's powers:—

'Then a woman of tact and brilliancy, like me, has an undue advantage in conversation with men. They are astonished at our instincts. They do not see where we got our knowledge; and, while they tramp on in their clumsy way, we wheel, and fly, and dart hither and thither, and seize with ready eye all the weak points, like Saladin in the desert. It is quite another thing when we come to write, and, without suggestion from another mind, to declare the positive amount of thought that is in us.'—Vol. ii. p. 88.

'For all the tides of life within me, I am dumb and ineffectual, when it comes to casting my thoughts into a form.'—Vol. ii. p. 90.

On reading the 'Novum Organum,' she says:—

'I have been examining myself with severity, intellectually as well as morally, and am shocked to find how vague and superficial is all my knowledge.'

Again:—

'For myself, I had wished to write a few pages now and then . . . but in truth I have not much to say; for since I have had leisure to look at

myself, I find that, so far from being an original genius, I have not yet learned to think to any depth, and that the utmost I have done in life has been to form my character to a certain consistency, cultivate my tastes, and learn to tell the truth with a little better grace than I did at first. For this the world will not care much.'—Vol. ii. p. 201.

She was sensitive, too, of all failure of gallant respect to women, as women; she could not bear what she called *sans culotte*, rude manners, and appreciated the ancient observances of courtesy which result from honour towards the weaker vessel. But along with these demands our friend was an advocate for woman's rights. After completing her pamphlet entitled, 'Women of the Nineteenth Century,' she felt 'a delightful glow of satisfaction, as if she had put a good deal of her true life into it.' In this pamphlet she demands from man every privilege acquired by himself—elective franchise, tenure of property, and liberty to speak in public assemblies—and suggests to her countrywomen the propriety of making their first stand for equal rights on the 'Texas Annexation project:' on this subject she would like to convene meetings of women everywhere. The men of her party profess to support these views. Mr. Emerson commits himself to a wish for political rights to women, without stipulations. Mr. Greeley, the editor of the 'Tribune,' with whose family she was domesticated some time,—more cautious, seems disposed to a compromise with his countrywomen. He stipulates for a relaxation of those stringent, somewhat imperious laws of politeness by which Americans are at present bound, as the penalty of their new privileges. He pleads the hardship of having to give his arm to conduct that woman out of the ball-room, or into the dining-room, or for a walk of half-a-mile in the dark, (perhaps at much personal inconvenience,) who insists upon her right and fitness to be a member of congress or a sea captain. However, Margaret would not see this at all, and still insisted on the old prescriptive civilities, in spite of his frequent arguments on the subject; which we are glad to know, as it proves her political aspirations to be very unreal things.

Margaret's fame really rests upon her conversational powers—of all gifts the most difficult to *report* to others. People cannot remember the words even, and words are not all: the look, the tone, the emphasis, all make good talking what it is to us, and these are incommunicable. However, these volumes furnish us with quite a new test by which to estimate excellence in this department, and, as the world goes, not at all a bad one—people *paid* to hear Margaret talk. We have seen that she felt writing difficult, tedious, unsatisfactory; yet she wanted money, and must have it. The ingenious idea then occurred to her, to turn her conversational powers to account in this way,

and at the same time to cultivate those of others; and she proposed to the ladies of Boston to establish a conversation *class*, of which she was to be the head and leader. The ladies of Boston were not backward to embrace this new idea; they were, in fact, astonishingly well prepared, each and all, with a store of the most profound remarks, which could nowhere else have found such appropriate expression. Margaret seems to have felt that there were multitudes of questions on which women had to make up their minds, which her present scheme would furnish a scene for, which could scarcely find an answer or be worked out on the domestic hearth, where so many interruptions come in the way. As her circular expresses it:—

‘ Could a circle be assembled in earnest, desirous to answer the questions —What are we born to do? and how shall we do it?—which so few ever propose to themselves till their best years are gone by, I should think the undertaking a noble one; and if my resources should prove sufficient to make me its moving spring, I should be willing to give to it a large portion of those coming years, which will, as I hope, be my best. I look upon it with no blind enthusiasm, nor unlimited faith, but with a confidence that I have attained a distinct perception of means, which, if there are persons competent to direct them, can supply a great want, and promote really high objects.’—Vol. ii. pp. 130, 131.

But we must not go on quoting from a document which really places a questionable project in a plausible light; if we did not know that fine talking, always a dangerous amusement, would be much more dangerous set out with all this formality, and rendered such an engine of display and pretension. Margaret, however, talked from a better motive than mere display; and she had, besides, sufficiently appropriate scenes for her own display elsewhere. She had, indeed, talked to her heart’s content in all the cities of the Union; and it was some credit that she would now bring out her full powers, such as they were, in a party of ladies only. She came to these meetings very well dressed, which is more than once noticed by those who report these meetings, (reminding us of the attention to this point in Tenneyson’s female college,) and altogether ‘looking sumptuously,’ and certainly, from the following passage, showed herself equal to carrying out her idea.

‘ She began them with an exordium, in which she gave her leading views; and those exordiums were excellent, from the elevation of the tone, the ease and flow of discourse, and from the tact with which they kept aloof from any excess, and from the gracefulness with which they were brought down, at last, to a possible level for others to follow. She made a pause, and invited the others to come in. Of course, it was not easy for every one to venture her remark after an eloquent discourse, and in the presence of twenty superior women, who were all inspired. But whatever was said, Margaret knew how to seize the good meaning of it with hospitality, and to make the speaker feel glad, and not sorry, that she had spoken. She showed

herself thereby fit to preside at such meetings, and imparted to the susceptible a wonderful reliance on her genius.'—Vol. ii. pp. 146, 147.

The class, Mr. Emerson informs us, first assembled at Miss Peabody's rooms in West-street, on the 6th November, 1839. Twenty-five ladies were present, and the circle comprised some of the most agreeable and intelligent women of Boston. They plunged at once into the meaning of the Grecian mythology, and a very esoteric line indeed was taken. 'The first day's topic was, 'the genealogy of heaven and earth; then the Will, (Jupiter); 'the Understanding, (Mercury); the celestial inspiration of 'genius, perception and transmission of divine law, (Apollo); 'the terrene inspiration, the impassioned abandonment of genius ' (Bacchus.)' Never surely was there such a glorification and transcendentalizing of Lempriere and Tooke!

Margaret writes to Mr. Emerson in great spirits about her class:—

'Mrs. — came out in a way that surprised me. She seems to have shaken off a wonderful number of films. She showed pure vision sweet sincerity, and much talent. Mrs. — keeps us in good order, and takes care that Christianity and morality are not forgotten. . . . I assure you, there is more Greek than Bostonian spoken at the meetings; and we may have pure honey of Hymettus to give you yet.'—Vol. ii. pp. 138, 139.

Many ladies write their impressions of these conversations, all with great delight, and with considerable talent, too, in giving the scene; and Margaret always satisfies. On one occasion, 'the earnestness and simplicity of the discussion, (on Beauty,) 'as well as the gifts and graces of the speakers, gave it the charm 'of a Platonic dialogue.' On another, 'Margaret unfolded her idea 'of Bacchus.' On another, the story of Cupid and Psyche was 'told with fitting beauty by Margaret, and many fine conjectural 'interpretations were suggested from all parts of the room.' Of a subsequent series a lady writes, 'I never heard, read of, or imagined conversation at all equal to this we have heard.' Another writes, 'It is sometimes said that women never are so 'lovely and enchanting in the company of their own sex merely, 'but it requires the other to draw them out. Certain it is that 'Margaret never appears when I see her either so brilliant or so 'deep in thought, or so desirous to please, or so modest, or so 'heart-touching, as in this very party.' But our readers may have a curiosity to judge for themselves what these conversations which charmed the hearers so much were like. The following discusses the actual question for which, it may be remembered, the meetings were first designed:—

'March 22, 1841.—The question of the day was, What is life?

'Let us define, each in turn, our idea of living. Margaret did not believe we had, any of us, a distinct idea of life.

'A. S. thought so great a question ought to be given for a written definition. "No," said Margaret, "that is of no use. When we go away to think of anything, we never do think. We all talk of life. We all have some thought now. Let us tell it. C—, what is life?"

'C— replied,—“It is to laugh, or cry, according to our organization.”

'“Good,” said Margaret, “but not grave enough. Come, what is life? I know what I think; I want you to find out what you think.”

'Miss P. replied,—“Life is division from one's principle of life in order to a conscious reorganization. We are cut up by time and circumstance, in order to feel our reproduction of the eternal law.”

'Mrs. E.—“We live by the will of God, and the object of life is to submit,” and went on into Calvinism.

'Then came up all the antagonisms of Fate and Freedom.

'Mrs. H. said,—“God created us in order to have a perfect sympathy from us as free beings.”

'Mrs. A. B. said she thought the object of life was to attain absolute freedom. At this Margaret immediately and visibly kindled.

'C. S. said,—“God creates from the fulness of life, and cannot but create; He created us to overflow, without being exhausted, because what He created necessitated new creation. It is not to make us happy, but creation is His happiness and ours.”

'Margaret was then pressed to say what she considered life to be.

'Her answer was so full, clear, and concise, at once, that it cannot but be marred by being drawn through the scattering medium of my memory. But here are some fragments of her satisfying statement.

'She began with God as Spirit, Life so full as to create and love eternally, yet capable of pause. Love and creativeness are dynamic forces, out of which we, individually, as creatures, go forth bearing his image, that is, having within our being the same dynamic forces, by which we also add constantly to the total sum of existence, and shaking off ignorance and its effects, and by becoming more ourselves, *i.e.* more divine;—destroying sin in its principle, we attain to absolute freedom, we return to God, conscious like Himself, and as his friends, giving as well as receiving, felicity for evermore. In short, we become gods, and able to give the life which we now feel ourselves able only to receive.

'On Saturday morning, Mrs. L. E. and Mrs. E. H. were present, and begged Margaret to repeat the statement concerning life, with which she closed the last conversation. Margaret said she had forgotten every word she said. She must have been inspired by a good genius, to have so satisfied everybody,—but the good genius had left her. She would try, however, to say what she thought, and trusted it would resemble what she had said already. She then went into the matter, and, true enough, she did not use a single word she used before.—Vol. ii. pp. 159—162.

After having faced, whether we have mastered or not, the awful depths of these remarks, the sterner sex will be in a fitting state of humility to receive a statement which candour obliges us to record, against the lords of the creation. The gentlemen, hearing the golden report of these meetings, begged that an evening class might be formed into which they might be admitted. It was agreed to—the subject was mythology. Mr. Emerson was present. He says:—

'Margaret spoke well,—she could not otherwise,—but I remember that she seemed encumbered, or interrupted, by the *headiness* or *incapacity* of the men, whom she had not had the advantage of training, and who fancied,

no doubt, that on such a question, they, too, must assert and dogmatize.'—Vol. ii. p. 162.

We must not, however, linger in the schools of this Athens of the West, but with no other connectives than are implied in the last words of our extract transport our readers to Europe, where Margaret at length finds herself, having repaired thither in the hope of restoring her health and exhausted energies. She had settled her family comfortably, and now felt herself at liberty to indulge her cherished longing; and gladly joining some friends who had planned the tour of our continent, sailed with them from New York, August 1846. There she plunges at once into congenial Scotch and English society—describes Wordsworth and De Quincy, gets benighted and nearly lost on Ben Lomond—of which adventure she writes home a very good description—comes to London, and is introduced to her teacher and hero Carlyle, whose 'trumpet blasts' had long ago aroused and awakened her. We leave the question to her biographers to settle how far it is right to publish her impressions of his conversation. We have only to do with the description itself, and those who have so recently read Mr. Carlyle's recollections of Coleridge's inspired discourse—his *sum-jective* and *om-jective*, too truthfully and pitilessly chronicled—his endless not-to-be-interrupted flow so ably satired—will be amused at the poetical justice of the following picture. Possibly the high tone of praise in the opening may be considered as atoning for what follows, but we doubt its really doing so; for what must be the quality or value of that eloquence which wearies the listener?

'Of the people I saw in London you will wish me to speak first of the Carlyles. Mr. C. came to see me at once, and appointed an evening to be passed at their house. That first time I was delighted with him. He was in a very sweet humour—full of wit and pathos, without being overbearing or oppressive. I was quite carried away with the rich flow of his discourse; and the hearty noble earnestness of his personal being, brought back the charm which once was upon his writing before I wearied of it. I admired his Scotch, his way of singing his great full sentences, so that each one was like the stanza of a narrative ballad. He let me talk now and then, enough to free my lungs and change my position, so that I did not get tired. . . I left him that night, intending to go out very often to their house. I assure you there never was anything so witty as Carlyle's description of —. It was enough to kill one with laughing. I on my side contributed a story to his fund of anecdote on this subject, and it was fully appreciated. Carlyle is worth a thousand of you for that; he is not ashamed to laugh when he is amused, but goes on in a cordial human fashion. The second time Mr. C. had a dinner party. . . — was allowed to interrupt him a little, of which one was glad, for that night he was in his more acrid mood; and though much more brilliant than on the former evening, grew wearisome to me, who disclaimed and rejected almost everything he said.

'For a couple of hours he was talking about poetry, and the whole harangue was one eloquent proclamation of the defects in his own mind. Tennyson wrote in verse because the schoolmasters had taught him that it

was great to do so, and had thus unfortunately been turned from the true path for a man. Burns had in like manner been turned from his vocation. Shakspeare had not had the good sense to see that it would have been better to write straight on in prose;—and such nonsense, which, though amusing enough at first, he ran to death after a while. The most amusing part is always when he comes back to some refrain, as in the French Revolution of the *Sea Green*. In this instance it was Petrarch and *Laura*—the last word pronounced with his ineffable sarcasm of drawl. Although he said this over fifty times, I could not ever help laughing when *Laura* would come; Carlyle running his chin out, when he spoke it, and his eyes glancing till they looked like the eyes and beak of a bird of prey. Poor *Laura*! Lucky for her that her poet had already got her safely canonized beyond the reach of this Teuflesdröckh vulture.

‘The worst of hearing Carlyle is, that you cannot interrupt him. I understand the habit and power of haranguing have increased very much upon him, so that you are a perfect prisoner when he has once got hold of you. To interrupt him is a physical impossibility. If you get a chance to remonstrate for a moment, he raises his voice and bears you down. True, he does you no injustice, and, with his admirable penetration, sees the disclaimer in your mind; so that you are not morally delinquent; but it is not pleasant to be unable to utter it.’—Vol. iii. pp. 96—99.

The conclusion of this remarkable woman’s history is so strange, romantic, and tragical, so removed in scene and circumstance from the tenor of her previous life, that but for some connecting links of tone and phraseology, it would often be hard to realize the identity of the American *esprit fort* and the Italian heroine. Europe was the country of her youth’s romance, and to her it certainly proved so. Her travels brought her to Rome in the spring of 1847, having previously in London formed a friendship with Mazzini. At once she plunged into the stormy politics of that time and place; so that from that period her letters to America are full of the feverish triumphs of the Revolution, the Pope’s early popularity, and the subsequent failure of the Republican cause, and the acute bitter disappointment of all concerned, of which she at least bore her share. She shows a fitting feminine abhorrence of fighting and bloodshed, and the other horrors inseparable from war, when it affects her own party (though she manifests little enough remorse at Rossi’s murder); and was so far naturalized and identified with the cause as to be placed, by a formal commission, in charge of a hospital for the wounded. There she made good practical use of her energy and talents, devoted herself with ardour to her harassing and painful duties, and won the enthusiastic love and reverence of the unhappy men under her care.

All this, however, we have not space for. The three years in and near Rome are distinguished by another event of a more personal nature. No other than her marriage, which she strangely chose to keep secret till it became absolutely necessary to disclose it. Some reasons are assigned for this secrecy

—as the peril to her husband's small patrimony had his Protestant marriage been prematurely disclosed; but she hardly affects to call this the real reason of her reserve to her own family. Margaret's views were so little in accordance with our Christian ideas on such subjects, that it is well to explain that there seems no reason to apprehend any discreditable cause for mystery. The lady of the American consul writes conclusively on this head. So for want of other reason we must suspect that Margaret was a little ashamed of herself in the matter, and really did not know how to tell her mother, and give such a turn to her history as should sustain her own intellectual dignity and supremacy. Madame de Staël, in her *Corinne*, compliments the men of Italy as being of all nations most tolerant of genius in women. And Mr. Emerson on one occasion speaks vaguely of the homage that was paid to Margaret there, and 'the offers of marriage made to her by distinguished parties;' but we must take leave to doubt this assertion in its literal sense. Admiration is one thing, many real proposals of marriage to such a woman as Margaret Fuller another. She does, indeed, speak in one letter of knowing in Milan 'some Radicals, young, and interested in ideas,' which of course were of her suggesting; but the peculiarity of her choice at last was, that he was *not* interested in ideas.

It is a very remarkable fact to those curious in such histories, that on the first—and as it seems in his case—decisive meeting between this plain eloquent woman and her future husband, (many years her junior,) she was as yet so little conversant with his language that they could hardly talk at all. The interest of the meeting was of quite another kind than the communication of ideas. Simply she lost her party in S. Peter's. He saw a foreign lady uneasy, possibly a little alarmed at finding herself alone, and evening coming on; and as any gentleman would, he offered his services first to get her carriage, and, none being to be found, to escort her home on foot, talking, as we have said, but little by the way. It was lucky for this little romance that her views of the proper place and position of woman had not taken so practical a turn as to make her, as they should in reason have done, superior to this confession of weakness and need of protection. The acquaintance thus begun was eagerly cultivated by the young Marquis Ossoli, who within a very short time made her the offer of his hand, which she at first refused. However, after a short independent tour to the chief Italian towns, she returned to Rome. Her influence induced him to take a decided part against the politics of his family in the liberal contest, and in December 1847 they were privately married. All her anxieties about public events were indefi-

nately increased by the discomforts and sometimes actual miseries her secret involved, besides the perpetual trial of want of money. In the September of the following year her son was born, and her husband's military duties, which he seems to have performed with great spirit and courage, and the necessity of leaving her child in the country, separated her from each except for occasional stolen interviews. She was truly devoted to both. She seems for the time to have enjoyed her husband's companionship the more because he was uncongenial to her intellectual nature, and did not value her for it. She compares his affection for her to the love of children, which she had always so highly valued. When she at length finds it necessary to write to her mother on the subject, she thus describes him. A very agreeable portrait it is; only,—could we change the personal pronouns—it would sound more naturally as a clever man's description of his *wife*:—

‘He is not in any respect such a person as people in general would expect to find with me. He had no instructor except an old priest, who entirely neglected his education; and of all that is contained in books he is absolutely ignorant; and he has no enthusiasm of character. On the other hand, he has excellent practical sense; has been a judicious observer of all that passed before his eyes; has a nice sense of duty, which, in its unflinching, minute activity may put most enthusiasts to shame; a very sweet temper, and great native refinement. His love for me has been unswerving and most tender. I have never suffered a pain that he could relieve. His devotion when I am ill is to be compared only with yours. His delicacy in trifles, his sweet domestic graces, remind me of E—. In him I have found a home, and one that interferes with no tie. Amid many ills and cares we have had much joy together, in the sympathy with natural beauty,—with our child,—with all that is innocent and sweet. I do not know whether he will always love me so well, for I am the elder, and the difference will become in a few years more perceptible than now. But life is so uncertain, and it is so necessary to take good things with their limitations, that I have not thought it worth while to calculate too curiously. . .

* * * * *

‘What shall I say of my child? All might seem hyperbole even to my dearest mother. In him I find satisfaction for the first time to the deep wants of my heart. . . . He is a fair child, with blue eyes, and light hair; very affectionate, graceful, and sportive. He was baptized in the Roman Catholic Church, by the name of Angelo Eugene Philip, for his father, grandfather, and my brother. He inherits the title of Marquis. Write the name of my child in your Bible, ANGELO OSSOLI, born September 5, 1848. God grant he may live to see you, and may prove worthy of your love!’—Vol. iii. pp. 225—227.

Ossoli, though in common with the liberal party he hated priests, is described as a devout Roman Catholic. He used to attend regularly the vespers service, (says one who has given an interesting sketch of their life at Florence before embarking on their fatal voyage,) in some of the older and quieter churches, and his wife frequently accompanied him on these occasions. The same writer, in relating some anecdotes

of Margaret's courage and her influence over the Italian peasantry, says,—

'Her husband related to me once, with a most reverent enthusiasm, some stories of the good she had done in Rieti during her residence there. . . . Such incidents . . . seemed to have inspired him with a feeling of respect for her amounting to reverence. This feeling, modifying the manifest tenderness with which he hung upon her every word and look, and sought to anticipate her simplest wishes, was luminously visible in the air and manner of his affectionate devotion to her. . . . He seemed quite absorbed in his wife and child. I cannot remember ever to have found Madame Ossoli alone on those evenings when she remained at home. Her husband was always with her. The picture of their room rises clearly before me . . . there, seated beside his wife, I was sure to find the Marchese reading from some patriotic book, and dressed in the dark brown red-corded coat of the Guardia Civica, which it was his melancholy pleasure to wear at home. So long as the conversation could be carried on in Italian, he used to remain, though he rarely joined in it to any considerable degree; but if a number of English and American visitors came in, he used to take his leave, and go to the Café d'Italia, being very unwilling, as Madame Ossoli told me, to impose any seeming restraint, by his presence, upon her friends, with whom he was unable to converse.'—Vol. iii. pp. 298—301.

The tragedy which so soon followed gives a melancholy interest to details which we must not further enlarge upon. How long this attachment between beings so dissimilar could have lasted may be doubted, yet for ourselves we have faith in Margaret so far that we believe this new relation, this life of the affections, might have led to further good. But the test of time was not to be granted. Various reasons determined Margaret to return to America, though with some regret at taking her husband to so uncongenial a sphere. However, it was in their plans to come back to Italy in a few years, perhaps to settle there. Margaret, always superstitious, had many nervous fears about the voyage, and Ossoli too, who had had previous experience of omens, recalled an early gipsy warning to beware of the sea. Not yielding to these dim fears, however, they took berths in the *Elizabeth* merchant vessel, sailing from Leghorn, as the expenses of the voyage by this means would be much lessened, and there were just grounds of confidence in the vessel and the captain. So Margaret embarked with all her treasures, her husband, her child, and next to these her manuscripts, her history of the Italian struggle for liberty, which the liberal party looked forward to as so true and full a record of their ineffectual labours. The first disaster of the voyage was the death of the captain from small-pox, which the poor little Angelino took from him, but through the careful nursing and sensible treatment of the parents soon recovered from. After this, from Gibraltar to within sight of the American shores, the winds and waves were propitious. On Thursday, July 15th,

the officer in command promised his passengers that the next day he would land them at New York. Joyful preparations were made by all on board, 'and with grateful hearts Margaret and Ossoli put Nino to rest, for the last time, as they thought, 'on ship board—for the last time, it was to be, on earth.' A hurricane arose in the night, but still no one had any fear, for the only cause for alarm, the dangerous Jersey coast, was believed to be far distant. All had retired to rest, when, at four o'clock of Friday morning the vessel ran aground on the Sand Bars of Long Island:—

'At the first jar, the passengers, knowing but too well its fatal import, sprang from their berths. Then came the cry of "Cut away," followed by the crash of falling timbers, and the thunder of the seas, as they broke across the deck. In a moment more, the cabin skylight was dashed in pieces by the breakers, and the spray, pouring down like a cataract, put out the lights, while the cabin door was wrenched from its fastenings, and the waves swept in and out. One scream, one only, was heard from Margaret's state-room. . . . It was in the grey dusk, and amid the awful tumult, that the companions in misfortune met. The side of the cabin to the leeward had already settled under water; and furniture, trunks, and fragments of the skylight were floating to and fro; while the inclined position of the floor made it difficult to stand; and every sea, as it broke over the bulwarks, splashed in through the open roof. The windward cabin-walls, however, still yielded partial shelter, and against it, seated *side by side*, half leaning backwards, with feet braced upon the *long table*, they awaited what next should come. At first, Nino, *alarmed at the uproar*, the darkness, and the rushing water, while *shivering with the wet*, cried passionately; but soon his mother, *wrapping him in such garments as were at hand*, and folding him to her bosom, sang him to sleep. Celeste too was in an agony of terror, till Ossoli, with soothing words and a long and fervent prayer, restored her to self-control and trust. Then calmly they rested side by side. . . . Thus passed three hours.'—Vol. iii. pp. 323, 324.

About seven in the morning there were symptoms of the cabin breaking up, and, with the greatest hazard and danger, they made their way on deck to the fore-castle, which was comparatively dry and sheltered, where the party again seated themselves, and, wrapped in the overcoats of the seamen, regained some warmth. The mate made his way then to the cabin, to save money and other valuables for the passengers. 'There still remains,' Margaret said, 'what, if I live, will be of more value to me than anything.' She meant her manuscripts; but it seemed too selfish to ask the brave sailor to run further risk. In the meanwhile they were within sight of shore; but the witnesses of the wreck were too busy gathering into carts whatever spoil was stranded, to make any efforts for the wretched people on deck; and even when a lifeboat was procured, none ventured to man her. It was seen from the wreck, only to add to the anguish of these mortal hours of agony. A desperate attempt was now proposed to save the passengers by means of

planks, placing each upon a plank and grasping handles of rope, while a sailor swam behind; and the widow of the captain was actually saved by this means. When Margaret's turn came, she resolutely refused to leave her husband and child. She was willing to adventure with them on a raft; but without them she would not go. Possibly, she did not know the success that had accompanied one attempt; possibly, she still depended on the life-boat; on whatever ground, she resisted all persuasions—she entertained a hope that they might yet be saved—saved all together.

'Alas! to the experienced eyes of the sailors it too soon became evident that there was no attempt to launch or man her. The last chance of aid from shore then was gone utterly. They must rely on their own strength, or perish. And if ever they were to escape, the time had come; for at noon the storm had somewhat lulled; but already the tide had turned, and it was plain that the wreck could not hold together through another flood. In this emergency, the commanding officer, who until now had remained at his post, once more appealed to Margaret to try to escape—urging that the ship would inevitably break up soon; that it was mere suicide to remain longer; that he did not feel free to sacrifice the lives of the crew, or to throw away his own; finally, that he would himself take Angelo, and that sailors should go with Celeste (the nurse), Ossoli, and herself. But, as before, Margaret decisively declared that she would not be parted from her husband or her child. The order was then given to "save themselves;" and all but four of the crew jumped over, several of whom, together with the commander, reached shore alive, though severely bruised and wounded by the drifting fragments.'—Vol. iii. pp. 329, 330.

It is remarkable, certainly, and we have therefore given these details, to see this strong-minded woman ruled by a blind instinct of affection, at such a moment, rather than by the sense and reason which had been her life-long boast, and which would unquestionably have led her to follow the directions of those who understood their situation so much better than she could do. But her habit of self-dependence seems to have prevailed over her judgment in this crisis. Little doubt seems to be entertained that some, at least, might have been spared had she yielded to the advice so urgently pressed upon her, as those were who obeyed the captain's orders. But we must remain for a few moments longer on the wreck, with those whom her influence still detained upon it:—

'It was now past three o'clock, and as, with the rising tide, the gale swelled once more to its former violence, the remnants of the barque fast yielded to the resistless waves. . . . It was plain to all that the final moment drew swiftly nigh. Of the four seamen who still stood by the passengers three were as efficient as any among the crew of the *Elizabeth*. These were the steward, carpenter, and cook. . . . These men were once again persuading Margaret Ossoli and Celeste to try the planks, which they held ready in the lee of the ship; and the steward, by whom Nino was so much beloved, had just taken the little fellow in his arms, with the pledge that

he would save him or die, when a sea struck the fore-castle, and the fore-mast fell, carrying with it the deck and all upon it. The steward and Angelino were washed upon the beach, both dead, though warm, some twenty minutes after. The cook and carpenter were thrown far upon the fore-mast, and saved themselves by swimming. Celeste and Ossoli caught for a moment by the rigging, but the next wave swallowed them up. Margaret sank at once. When last seen she had been seated at the foot of the fore-mast, still clad in her white night-dress, with her hair fallen loose upon her shoulders. It was over—that twelve hours' communion face to face with death! it was over! and the prayer was granted, "that Ossoli, Angelo, and I, may go together, and that the anguish may be brief." . . . "It is a touching coincidence," writes a friend of Margaret's, who hastened to the coast on hearing of the wreck, "that the only one of Margaret's treasures which reached the shore, was the lifeless form of Angelino. When the body, stripped of every rag by the waves, was rescued from the surf, a sailor took it reverently in his arms, and wrapping it in his neckcloth, bore it to the nearest house. There, when washed, and dressed in a child's frock found in Margaret's trunk, it was laid upon a bed; and as the rescued seamen gathered round their late playfellow and pet, there were few dry eyes in the circle. . . . Next day, borne upon their shoulders, in a chest which one of the sailors gave for a coffin, it was buried in a hollow among the sand-heaps. . . . To-morrow, Margaret's mother, sister, and brothers will remove Nino's body to New England."—Vol. iii. pp. 330—335.

No trace was found of the precious manuscripts,—of all the writings on which she had been so busy, and which she brought to her own country for publication; nothing but Margaret's and Ossoli's love letters remain.

We need add no comments of ours to this sad and affecting story, throwing so strange a pathos as it does over a character calculated to excite a very different class of feelings. Many thoughts are suggested by it; thoughts of that special Providence in which she did not believe, and to which, as it seems, she did not appeal in her extremity, as far at least as we may gather from the absence of all mention of such an appeal; thoughts of pity, too, and admiration for the love and constancy which death could not shake: and of hope, if the term is not too positive, that changes there may have been in the innermost soul as great as were wrought by the few last years in her external nature, of which—by the tokens of manner and deportment—her friends could judge, give witness. Hers is an instructive history, though the tone of her biographers may make it also a dangerous one to all who cannot discriminate between the points of her actual character and the circumstances of her life, and their comments upon them.

ART. V.—ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΙΚΕΤΙΑΕΣ. *Æschyli Supplices. Recensuit F. A. PALEY. Editio Emendatio.* Cambridge: Deighton. 1851.

THE appearance of a second edition of Mr. Paley's *Supplices of Æschylus* within seven years, may, we hope, be taken as a sign that classical studies are not so much neglected in England as their best friends are sometimes tempted to suppose. The experiment was rather a crucial one. The play with which Mr. Paley commenced his labours on Æschylus had the advantage or disadvantage of being the one of the whole seven on which the least attention had been bestowed. We do not know how it is at Cambridge, but at Oxford, to the present day, candidates even for the highest honours, while including Æschylus in their list of books for examination, are accustomed to make a special exception in disfavour of the *Supplices*. With books, as with dogs, it would seem, to get a bad name is as fatal as hanging. The play is by no means the most difficult, or, considered as a whole, the most corrupt of the remains of the great poet; but it happens to contain one passage of tolerable length which has been more tampered with than any in the Greek drama, and on the strength of this a *cordon sanitaire* has been drawn round the whole. The act of injustice thus done is great, and the loss considerable. If not the oldest extant specimen of Æschylus, and consequently of Grecian tragedy, it is, at any rate, as Professor Blackie remarks, the one which, by the simplicity of its structure, is best adapted to give us a notion of the Athenian stage in its earlier days, when the lyrical element was still prevalent over the dramatic. Nor is the interest which it creates merely historical. The Chorus supports the main burden of the play, and it is equal to the weight. We are not, indeed, thrilled by the spirit of unconscious prophecy, as in the odes of the Agamemnon, nor awed by the actual voice of divine vengeance embodied, as in those of the Eumenides; but we are everywhere made conscious of a mingled tone of tenderness and austerity, of timidity and heroism, of grateful emotion and self-possessed dignity, of fervent entreaty and calm resignation, which reminds us not only that the songs are those of suppliant maidens, but that the minstrel is Æschylus.

It must not be dissembled, that the neglect of which we complain is in some measure owing to the critics. Up to the beginning of the present century, so far as we know, as fair a

chance had been given to the Supplices as to any of the sister dramas. In those days, the holiday task-work of editing a single play had not become common—at least, in the case of an author like Æschylus, less voluminous even than the writer whose ‘historical works’ startled Mr. Cobden the other day so unaccountably by their unknown bulk. What Stanley, Pauw, and Schutz did for the other six plays, that they did for the Supplices—not that we mean to class the three together, to lower the German to the level of the Dutchman, or to raise him to that of the Englishman. When the Glasgow edition was enriched by the sweepings of Porson’s study, the portion of the inheritance which fell to the Supplices was not the least extensive: nor were they forgotten in Butler’s cumbrous Variorum. But since that time, the favours of fortune have been partial. Blomfield’s Æschylus, as is well known, embraces only five plays out of the seven; and the Supplices was, unfortunately, one of those which the pall of episcopal investiture consigned to their funeral. Mr. Burges, indeed, some years before, had singled them out for the honour of his special notice; but his devotion too much resembles that of the savages, who assume the right of chastising and torturing the objects of their adoration. Scholefield is meagreness itself: generally judicious, as a man will always appear who seldom commits himself, but with little positive merit. His book, however, was fortunate enough to draw forth a masterly article by J. Wordsworth in the ‘Philological Museum,’ and in this the Supplices occupy a considerable place; but the remarks, though extremely valuable, are fragmentary and scattered, and cannot be said to amount to a regular commentary. In Germany, things have not been much better. Klausen, who has entered into the poet’s meaning more thoroughly than any editor of the present—perhaps, of any generation—did not live to advance beyond the Agamemnon and the Choephoræ. Hermann, the Coryphæus of a rival school of criticism, though reputed to be engaged on Æschylus all his life, published scarcely anything of importance, except on the Eumenides. Of those who have brought out complete editions of the seven plays, Wellauer is discreet, and at times highly ingenious, but far too dogmatic in his adherence to the text of the MSS., especially as while repudiating correction, he rarely attempts explanation. Bothe, rash and inconsiderate to the last degree in his youth, has been tamed down by advancing years not so much into wisdom as into dulness. Haupt, so far as we are aware, is the only one who has treated the Supplices separately; and his notes are more remarkable for useless facts and unfruitful speculations than for any real light which they throw either on the language, or on the sense.

Such was the state of criticism when Mr. Paley’s first edition

appeared. No candid judge, we conceive, can deny that it did much for the play, both critically and exegetically. Mr. Linwood, indeed, in a paper in the 'Classical Museum,' attempted something like a wholesale disparagement of its critical merits; but the force of his strictures was neutralized at the outset by a *naïve* confession, that but for having been thus anticipated in the publishing market, he had meant to edit the drama himself. The faults which he exposed might have been traced mainly to one cause—an imperfect acquaintance with the writings of others. For a defect like this, the best apology is amendment: and of such an amendment the book before us is the best evidence. Warned by experience, Mr. Paley has now read and written up to his time: the result is seen not only in his adoption of the corrections or explanations of preceding critics, but also in those cases where he still sees right to trust to his own judgment. If in the course of the following remarks we have detected a few remaining oversights, they may serve to remind us of the truth of the maxim, *εἰς ἀνὴρ οὐ πάνθ' ὄρα*. But they can no longer, even in the mind of the most prejudiced, interfere with a recognition of Mr. Paley's just claims to the honours of successful labour in a comparatively untried field.

We proceed to examine Mr. Paley's notes in detail, after the usual caution to our readers against supposing that the proportion of our points of agreement with him to our points of difference is to be measured by the space which they occupy respectively in our critique. Those who follow him as we have done, and those only, will be in a position to do justice to his distinctive merits—his critical sagacity, occasionally rising to real intuitive felicity, his appreciation of the conditions of language, removed alike from transcendental refinement and narrow bigotry to usage, the good taste which enables him, as a general rule, to perceive the natural requirements of a passage, and the variety of his reading, which frequently supplies the very illustration wanted to clear up a difficulty.

V. 3. Mr. Paley gives up Abresch's conjecture, ἀποπρὸ στομίῳ, which he had adopted in his first edition, and returns to the old reading, ἀπὸ προστομίῳ. We do not feel sure that his retractation is a wise one. Στόμιον is unquestionably a good word: προστόμιον less clearly so, not being sufficiently supported by προστομία, προστομίς, πρόστομος, in all of which πρὸ appears to have a peculiar force, hardly discernible here. Ἀποπρὸ, on the other hand, is abundantly justified by examples, and well explained by Mr. Paley himself, αἶρεν ἀποπρὸ γῆς, 'ita solvere ut procul a terrâ feraris, ut Danaus ex Ægypto ad Argos relatus.' The 'librorum auctoritas,' in the matter of a division of words, is next to nothing; and the Aldine ἀπὸ στομίῳ may be set against

the fact, that the Scholiast undoubtedly did read *προστομίον*. In preferring *λεπτοφαιμάθων*, Pauw's correction of *λεπτομαθών*, to Stanley's *τῶν λεπτοβαθῶν* (the latter word after Vettori), we cordially agree with Mr. Paley.

V. 8. Here again Mr. Paley recalls the common text, *τὸν φυξάνορα*, for which he had substituted Hermann's *φυξανορία*. The position of the article, so far from being an objection, is rather an argument in favour of the old reading, showing that *αὐτογενὴ ἄσεβῃ τε* are to be construed as what Donaldson (*New Cratylus*, § 301) calls a tertiary predicate. So, v. 27, *δέξαισθ' ἱκέτην τὸν θηλυγενὴ στόλον*. Mr. Paley, preferring to regard it generally as a case of 'articulus insolenter interpositus,' illustrates it by two instances not really in point, below, v. 190, and Theb. 315, in both of which the insertion of *καὶ* between the various epithets of the same word seems to us fatal to the supposed parallel. More serious objections to *τὸν φυξάνορα* are the MS. variations between *τὸν φυλαξάνοραν* and *φυξάνοραν*, and the metrical rule against the concurrence of four short syllables in an anapaestic system, a licence which, though occasionally indulged in by Euripides, seems not to have been elsewhere taken by *Æschylus*. *φυξάνωρ* itself, as an epithet of *γάμος*, has strong probability, and may be compared with *ἀστεργάνορα παρθενίαν*, in *Prom.* 898.

In v. 19, Mr. Paley seems right in adopting Haupt's correction *νῦν* for *οὖν*, as he assuredly is in reading, after Robortello, *ὦ πόλις, ὦ γῆ*, v. 23. Not to dwell on the harshness of the repetition of the relative in the common text, *ὦν—ὦν*, nor on the difficulty of supplying an antecedent, the structure of the whole sentence shows that *πόλις* and *γῆ* must be vocatives, as the invocation is clearly intended to run in the second person (cf. *πέμψατε*, v. 33), and the language will not allow us to separate *ὕπατοί τε θεοὶ κ.τ.λ.* from the rest of the sentence. *Τρίτος*, being a constant epithet of Zeus in his character of *Σωτῆρ*, seems to be used less strictly than it would have been had it merely signified *third in order*—a sense, however, which it may be made to bear without doing violence to the passage, as Mr. Paley has shown. In v. 27, we need hardly say, *δέξαισθ'* has been rightly changed into *δέξαισθ'* or *δέξασθ'*.

V. 41. We are glad to see that Mr. Paley is disposed to modify the rigour of his original sentence, 'Verba *τιμάωρ* ἰνὺν τ' procul dubio corrupta sunt.' He now pronounces them 'suspecta;' but even to this we must demur. Why should not *τιμάωρ* and *τιμάωρος* be equally legitimate, like *χρυσάωρ* and *χρυσάωρος*? Nor is there anything unusual in the epexegetical *τε*, another instance of which occurs almost immediately, v. 60, as Mr. Paley has himself remarked. The punctuation of v. 47, connecting

ἐφαψιν with what follows, not with what goes before, has long since been anticipated by Schutz.

V. 49. Mr. Paley rejects the Scholiast's interpretation of ἐπιλεξαμένα by ἐπικαλουμένη, though supported by Hesychius, as destitute of authority, remarking, that even if the verb could be used in this sense, the sentence would rather require the present participle. We think, however, that ἐπικεκλωμένα above, v. 40, is nearly decisive of the meaning of ἐπιλεξαμένα here, as it certainly is of the admissibility of the aorist on the assumption that this meaning is the true one.

V. 52. Here we cannot doubt that Mr. Paley has done right in at last receiving Porson's emendation ἄτ' ἀνόμεν' οἶμαι, in the place of that by which he had formerly proposed himself to supersede the corrupt reading of the MSS. Τε in τά τε νῦν, which he seems to consider an objection, is clearly like παιῶν τε γενοῦ, in Agam. 99, ἀρχάς τε . . . ἔξει, Choeph. 86, the contrast between τῶν πρόσθε and τὰ νῦν tending to bring out its force with peculiar distinctness.

V. 58. Mr. Paley, in his first edition, retained the MSS. reading ἀκούων, avoiding the charge of tautology by rendering αἰῶν 'understanding,' not 'hearing,' and construing, after Wellauer, ὅπα with δοξάσει, as in Choeph. 829, πῶς ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ . . . δοξάσω; In the interpretation of αἰῶν, to which he still adheres, he is probably right: in the construction of δοξάσει, which he now silently rejects, he seems to have been in error, as, admitting that δοξάζω may = νομίζω, we have yet to prove that δοξάσει ὅπα can stand for δοξάσει αὐτὸν ὅπα εἶναι. Nevertheless, ἀκούων, as it appears to us, might yet be defended, many other words of similar signification to δοξάζω being constructed with a participle as well as with an infinitive (such as αἰσθάνομαι, οἶδα, μανθάνω, &c.), if it were worth while to contend against the probability of so slight a corruption as that of εἰν into ὠν. In the preceding verse, Mr. Paley's second thoughts are certainly best, having led him to adopt Bamberger's suggestion, which by the omission of οἰκτρὸν and the resolution of the diphthong in ἔγγαιος, makes the metre correspond with that of the antistrophe. We wish, however, that he had been able to throw any additional light on the words which immediately follow, Τηρέας μήτιδος οἰκτρᾶς ἀλόχου, where the old interpretation, making Τηρέας μήτιδος equivalent to Τηρέως, and the new one, construing μήτιδος οἰκτρᾶς, *miserandæ propter consilium*, strike us as equally bad. Ματέρος for μήτιδος had occurred to us as a plausible conjecture before we knew it to have been anticipated by Bothe in his earlier and more innovating days; but it is an obvious objection that it would require to be separated from Τηρέας, with which its position would naturally connect it.

V. 66. Like Mr. Paley, we see no sufficient reason for altering

Ἰαονίοισι, which, as he remarks, contrasts well with Νειλοθερῇ in the next line. The descent of the Danaïdes from Io gives a further propriety to the word (cf. *Prom.* 840), though there is neither authority nor reason for interpreting it 'querelis ad Iūs labores accommodatis.' The peculiarity of the national Ionian measure is also evidently alluded to.

V. 74. This line appears to us palpably corrupt. *Η καὶ is deficient in authority, (the oldest reading being ἡ βαί,) and does not help the sense: nor is it easy to believe with Mr. Paley that τέλεον ἔχειν means *votorum compotes fieri*. Schutz's ἦσαν by a very slight change restores tolerable sense, though there remains some harshness in the expression ἦσαν ἔχειν, 'to enjoy the prime of another.' In this respect, perhaps, ἡμαρ might be a better word, τέλεον ἡμαρ being used for the marriage, like Homer's δούλιον, ἐλεύθερον, νόστιμον ἡμαρ. M and β are occasionally confused, as above, (v. 15,) where for κύμ' ἄλιον, Robortello's MS. gives κυβαλέων, and in other instances referred to by Mr. Paley on v. 3. The sense of τέλεον was long since noticed by Stanley, but has not been attended to by later editors.

V. 77. Mr. Paley's ἔστιν δὲ πτολέμῳ, for ἔστι δὲ καὶ πτολέμου, is ingenious and probable: 'cur enim πτ.?'

Vv. 90—95. Wellauer has done much to restore this passage: ἦμενον ἄνω, however, still remains to disturb the metre. Mr. Paley reads ἦμενος ὄν, the latter word a conjecture of Haupt's: νήμενον ὄν might also be proposed, or σεμνὸν ἄνω. But we should greatly prefer to read ἃ μέμονεν, both as accounting better for the existing text and as more probable intrinsically. Lachmann, we have since found, suggested ἦν μεμόνη, which may reasonably be allowed to confirm our emendation, at the same time that it nearly anticipates it.

V. 101. We rather wonder that none of the editors should have thought of separating διάνοιαν into δι' ἄνοιαν. The language would be improved by the change, ἄνοια being the better word of the two, from its frequent application to acts of irregular passion (noticed by Mr. Paley elsewhere), and the construction with the preposition less involved than without it. Curiously enough, the scholiast uses the very word ἄνοια to explain δυσπαραβούλοισι φρεσίν: but the rest of his gloss shows him to have read διάνοιαν, unless we can suppose that two independent interpretations have come to be accidentally confused.

V. 108. Mr. Paley has done wisely to retract his condemnation of the MSS. reading, ζῶσα γόοις με τιμῶ. The appropriateness of the sentiment no one has denied: indeed, many passages have been adduced in imitation of it: τιμῶ is shown by parallel instances to be a very fitting word: and με for ἐμαντήν, the only difficulty which remains, might have been supported by Cho.

1060. ἐλευθέρον σε τῶνδε πημάτων κτίσει. — Cf. Jelf, § 652, obs. 5.

V. 109. For ἰλέομαι Burges would read ἰλάομαι, which is more probable, not only as being itself the less doubtful form of the two, but as better suited to the dialect of the Chorus. So ἱλαος is used instead of the Attic ἰλέως in the choral parts of tragedy. In the next line the reading of the Med. seems clearly to point to Boissonade's conjecture, εὖ, γὰ, κοινεῖς. The sense, too, requires a vocative, to show who is addressed: and ἰὼ γὰ βοῦνι, v. 756, makes strongly for γὰ here. Donaldson, in the new edition of his Cratylus, p. 659, pronounces the passage 'almost hopelessly corrupt,' and proceeds to rewrite it: but he fails to satisfy us either of the existence of corruption, or of the probability of his restoration. When he says that he 'cannot believe that the 'second person of a verb would be inserted in the adversative 'clause to ἰλέομαι μὲν, and before ἐμπιτνῶ, which is the legitimate 'antithesis,' we are at a loss to see his meaning. If the objection is to the second person of a verb used in the adversative clause to one in which the first person is used, we can only refer him, among numberless other instances, to Cho. 848, ἠκούσαμεν μὲν, πυνθάνου δὲ τῶν ξένων. He may reply that this instance is not parallel, as the clause there is really, not apparently adversative. This brings us to the real question as regards the present passage. Δὲ in the clause καρβᾶνα δ' αὐδὰν is not, as it seems to us, adversative to μὲν, but copulative, the adversative δὲ coming just where he wishes it to come, before ἐμπιτνῶ. Similar instances are by no means uncommon: e.g. Eum. 95—100, where μὲν in ὦν μὲν ἔκτανον answers neither to αἰσχρῶς δ' nor to προυννέπω δ', but to παθοῦσα δ'. But what has this to do with the change of persons, unless indeed he would plead it as an objection that there happens to be no verb in the second person in the lines just referred to? πολλάκι he complains of as feeble in a sentence expressing the visible act of the suppliants: but the weakness is rather in the self-description itself, 'that most undramatic of all mannerism,' as Blackie justly calls it, than in the adverb. In Cho. 423, sqq. visible acts are described as repeated.

V. 115. Here, as on v. 108, Mr. Paley withdraws a suspicion formerly expressed against the text—this time, we think, not quite so wisely. Hermann's ἐπίδρομ' ὑπιθι is an infinite improvement on the reading which preceded it, being in closer conformity to the MSS. while it restores the metre and the language; but the sense remains *in statu quo*, not impossible, but very harsh.

Vv. 135—140. These lines are confessedly corrupt, the general sense being clear, but the reading of some of the words doubtful in the last degree. Mr. Paley defends v. 137 as it stands,

referring ἐνώπια to the place where the statue of Artemis was standing, and comparing μάκαρες εὐεδροι in Theb. 97, an interpretation far superior both in external authority and intrinsic appropriateness to the common one, which renders ἐνώπια 'the countenance.' To those who still question the words of the MSS. we beg to offer a suggestion of our own, ἔχουσα σεμνὸν ὅπ' ἀτασθαλοῖς, 'keeping stern looks for the insolent,' which would harmonize well with the preceding line and with the whole context. Ὠπα may be masculine, as it occasionally is in Attic, or σεμνὸς may be a word of two terminations as well as of three, like many others to be found in Æschylus. In the next line Mr. Paley now reads παντὶ δὲ σθένει διωγμοῖς (σθένει 'ν διωγμοῖς was Butler's conjecture); but we doubt the corruption of σθένουσι into σθένει, nor do we see any good construction for the second dative διωγμοῖς. Πάντα δὲ σθένουσ' ἄρωγός, the first part being from Lachmann, has struck us as a possible rather than a likely conjecture. As to the following line we can speak with greater confidence: ἀσφαλῆας, for which ἀσφαλῆς, ἀσφαλῆως, ἀσμένως, have been proposed, appears to us clearly a mistake for ἄς φίλας, 'her dear one,' the substitution of which would benefit the sense, while it tallies with the MSS. far better than the other words.

V. 146. There can be no doubt that Wellauer's τὸν γαῖον approaches more nearly than Mr. Paley's old reading, τὸν Ζαγρέα, both to the τὸν ταῖον of the MSS. and to the τὸν ἀγραῖον of the grammarians; nor does the fact that these latter quote the passage à propos of Zagreus create any great probability that his name was originally found there. Their meaning seems to be no more than this: Zagreus (ὁ μεγάλως ἀγρεύων) is an epithet of Pluto: Æschylus in his Sisyphus uses it in conjunction with πολυξένῳ, if not as a synonyme for it, πολύξενος being elsewhere used to express the same attribute of universal receptiveness in the Egyptians, (Supplices.)

V. 153. Mr. Paley had before adopted Haupt's μαστίκτειρα: he now recalls μάστειρ', with an obelus. We have no doubt that the reading of the MSS. is right, though the full force of it has not yet been properly explained. The allusion is to the office of the μαστήρες at Athens, a body (in the words of Liddell and Scott) appointed to seek after public debtors, or to ascertain the fortune of exiles with a view to confiscation. In the present case, the inquisition is after the persons of the exiles: but this need not bar the applicability of the reference. The herald in v. 897 describes himself as a μαστήρ of this kind, by speaking of his patron god, Ἑρμῇ μεγίστῳ προξένῳ μαστηρίῳ. The construction here will then be Ἰοὺς μῆνις μάστειρ' ἐκ θεῶν, 'The wrath which attacked Io is sent from the Gods to hunt out me,'—Ἰοὺς μῆνις answering to ἄταν γαμετᾶς in the next sentence.

V. 181. Mr. Paley properly remarks on ὀππῆρες εἶεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, with which he compares δεῦρ' ἐποπτεύσαι, Cho. 583. The common Greek phrase, θεωρεῖν εἰς ἀγῶνας, is another instance of the same thing.

V. 182. We are not sure that τεθυμμένος is the best correction that has been proposed for the unintelligible τεθειμένος of the MSS. The confusion between υ and ει is easy enough, and has in fact actually taken place in the Aldine text of the preceding verse, where πεπεισμένοι is found instead of πεπυσμένοι; but the word itself is not very common, and the use of the compound ἐπι-τεθυμμένος in Plat. Phædr. § 8, is scarcely parallel, as there a play is specially intended on the name of Typhon, so that the sense may be a little strained. Pearson's τεθηγμένος is unexceptionable in itself, and at least equally near to the old reading, the difference between ΕΙ (as it would originally be written) and EI being next to nothing. It may stand alone as well as τεθυμμένος, so that we need not trouble ourselves about its relation to ὠμῇ ξὺν ὀργῇ, even if we should agree with Mr. Paley that the preposition is a decided bar to the construction of those words with a passive participle, which, in the face of the various instances adduced of the instrumental or quasi-instrumental use of σύν, we should be scarcely prepared to do.

V. 185. We are sorry that Mr. Paley's judgment has not been proof against Professor Blackie's arguments in defence of the old interpretation of ἀγῶνιοι θεοί, 'the gods of contests.' To say that the Chorus, being themselves engaged in an ἀγὼν βίου, would naturally invoke the gods of contests, is a little far-fetched, when we consider that the ἀγῶνες in question are the public games. Nor do we attribute much weight to Mr. Paley's remark, that the four gods afterwards invoked (vv. 206—216) happen to be the patrons of the great Grecian games. In Agam. 513, all the ἀγῶνιοι θεοί are invoked in a body, Zeus and Apollo having been previously addressed separately, while Hermes is mentioned immediately afterwards—a proof that the term is not there meant to be coextensive with the four deities.

V. 190. Mr. Paley, as we have seen on v. 8, now defends τὰ χρεῖ, which he formerly proposed to get rid of either by correction or by expunging the whole verse. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that the article can have been added without any object to the third of a string of adjectives connected by καί, in spite of Theb. 315, to which we recommend Mr. Paley to add Cho. 728, χθόνιον δ' Ἑρμῆν καὶ τὸν νύχιον: and the only attempt that has been made to give a force to the article here, that of Bothe, fails in so far as it imposes a sense on χρεῖος which it cannot bear immediately below in v. 198. Mr. Paley's own conjecture, ξάχρει, is so good, that we wonder his parental partiality did not lead him to adopt it rather than defend a very doubtful position.

V. 194. Mr. Paley has a very satisfactory note on the peculiar use of μάταιος and similar words, such as μῶρος, ἄνους, ἄφρων, ἀνόητος, in the sense of irregular passion, which, like him, we commend to the 'lector studiosus.' The use is an unquestionable one, and yet very liable to be overlooked, like that of πλεονεξία in S. Paul's Epistles.

V. 195. This line might have given Mr. Paley an opportunity of noticing the different forces of ἐκ and παρὰ with the genitive. The expression was to come *out of* the brow, *from beside* the eye. To the instances which he collects to prove that the Greeks made the eyes the seat of modesty, add Aristot. Rhet. ii. 6. 18, who quotes as a proverb, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶναι αἰδῶ, though he seems to understand it of the eyes not of the bashful person, but of those before whom bashfulness is felt.

V. 203. Scholefield and Mr. Paley are surely right in removing this line from after v. 206 to its present place, so as to make ἴδοιτο follow ἴδοι just as συγγνοῖτο follows συγγνοή, vv. 211, 212. Admitting this instance of confusion, we can hardly plead the authority of the MSS. against Mr. Paley's transposition of vv. 209, 210. To place the three lines 209—211 in the mouth of the Chorus, as is commonly done, is to violate the symmetry of the Dialogue: while there is something harsh in supposing with Scholefield the line ἀγνόν τ' Ἀπόλλω to be spoken by Danaus. The objection, however, to the commonly received order, that it introduces an absurd designation of the sun as Ζηνὸς ὄρνις, does not seem convincing. Whether or no any faith is to be put in the equivocal sense of the word ἀλέκτωρ, we can readily see how the sun might come to be called ὄρνις, as the eagle is called Διὸς κύων—both of them terms not strictly applicable, but conveying the general notion of ministering, and themselves used by the tragedians with very considerable latitude of meaning. Ζηνὸς ὄρνις and ἀγνὸς Ἀπόλλων must then be considered as two different titles of the same god, coupled by τε as in vv. 41, 60—not an unnatural supposition when we consider that Danaus is interpreting the Greek deities by his Egyptian notions. Possibly some actual symbol may be intended: but this we throw out merely as a conjecture. A further confirmation of the common view may be derived from the word σωτηρίου, which looks as if it might refer to the delegated power of Zeus σωτήρ, given in this case to the sun as the minister of Zeus as it is given in Cho. 2. to Hermes, πατρὶ' ἐποπτεύων κράτη. These considerations appear sufficient to make us hesitate before we reject the old interpretation, which comes to us with a traditional authority from the scholiast. Otherwise we might easily acquiesce in the propriety and simplicity of Mr. Paley's view, making Ζηνὸς ὄρνις the eagle, which is represented on the altar of Zeus as his symbol, as the trident is on that of Neptune, v. 214. Even then, how-

ever, two important objections would have to be removed—first the improbability that Danaus would direct the Chorus to invoke the eagle, especially after Zeus himself had just been formally invoked; and secondly, the fact that the Chorus takes no notice whatever of the request, but proceeds at once to address the sun.

V. 220. Mr. Paley appears now to have got rid of the difficulty which he formerly found in the words *κίρκων τῶν ὁμοπτέρων φόβῳ* κ.τ.λ. The fact is simply that there is a slight confusion between the *εἰκόν* and the *μεταφορά*, the sentence beginning with the first, *ἔσμός ὡς πελειάδων*, and then passing into the second. Sophocles (*Ajax*, 168) furnishes us with a precise parallel, *Παταγοῦσιν ἄτε πτηνῶν ἀγέλαι· Μέγαν αἰγυπιδὸν δ' ὑποδείσαντες Τάχ' ἂν ἐξαίφνης εἰ σὺ φανείης Σιγῇ πτήξειαν ἄφωνοι*. In the present passage of course the similitude is not quite perfect, as the prohibition of intercourse between hawks and doves is not founded on their affinity but on their absolute diversity. The notion contained in *ὁμοπτέρων*, however, is exactly expressed by Juvenal's '*Parcit cognatis maculis similis fera*,' which Stanley quotes on v. 222.

V. 223. Mr. Paley does not notice Dindorf's adoption of the unauthorized alteration *ἄκοντος πατρὸς* for *πάρα*: he might, however, have done well to protest against it, as one of many similar pieces of rashness in which this Editor has recently indulged. *Γαμεῖν τινα παρά τινος* evidently means to marry a woman from her father's house, so that while the two readings come exactly to the same thing, that of the MSS. is much more idiomatic and appropriate.

V. 225. *Μάταιος αἰτίαν* was proposed by Mr. Paley in a review some time before Linwood suggests it in his *Lexicon*. We prefer it decidedly to the other conjecture, *ματαίων αἰτίας*.

V. 226. A comparison of the various MSS. readings, *ταπλα ἐν μακῶς, τα πλα ενμαβῶς, ταπλά ἐνρά ὡς, τὰπλά ἐγμάβας*, with the incontestibly genuine *τὰπλακήμαθ' ὡς*, first restored by Stephens, may show not only the impossibility of maintaining the authority of MSS. in all cases against that of critics, but the necessity of occasionally admitting conjectures which have few, if any, palæographical considerations to support them. The differences of the old readings among themselves are easily accounted for: but the difference between any one of them and Stephens' restoration is one not easily to be explained by the ordinary instances of confusion of letters. Doubtless the transcriber thought he was copying correctly, as he does not seem to have been misled by any definite notions of making sense of the passage: but we cannot tell in what state the original words may have presented themselves to him, nor on what principle he is likely to have attempted to deal with them.

V. 228. We think Mr. Paley ought to have adopted Stanley's *τρόπον* for *τόπον*. The latter is of course defensible *per se*, but less likely under the circumstances. The Chorus would most naturally have taken their place as soon as they heard their father's direction a few lines above. On the other hand, the use of *ἀμείβεσθε*, v. 191, points strongly to the sense of *answering*. If it be objected that Danaus has ceased for some time to give any directions about the tone of their reply, we may observe with Schutz, that the lines immediately preceding contain the plea which he wishes them to urge, though not expressed in the way of dictation; and, further, that the present verse has the appearance of being spoken just as the king is perceived to be approaching—'Take care, and answer as I bade you just now.'

V. 230. *στόλον*, in the sense of a 'company,' is harsh after *ὄμιλον*, though perhaps to be defended by the instances of pleonasm given by Porson on Phœn. 22. It seems better to understand it as an 'equipment,' not precisely identical with *στολή*, but nearly equivalent to *οἱ ἐσταλμένοι*. This seems the meaning of the word in v. 2 above—an expedition, with special reference to the nautical sense of *στέλλειν*, which may also be that intended here. 'Ἀνέλληνα στόλον then will mean *ἀνελληνικῶς ἐσταλμένοι*, 'Accoutred as for a journey in other than Greek fashion.' Otherwise *στολήν* might be conjectured, with some plausibility, to be constructed, not with *ἀνέλληνα*, but in the manner indicated by the Schol., *τὸν οὐχ Ἑλληνα κατὰ στολήν*.

V. 240. Mr. Paley's punctuation after *τάλλα* removes a difficulty which could not but be felt so long as the word was supposed to be connected with *πολλὰ*,—the position of the article.

V. 244. We agree with Mr. Paley in having some doubt about *τηρὸν*, though his correction, *τηρόραβδον ἱρὸν*, strikes us as rather hazardous. Possibly *ὀτρηρὸν ἱροραβδον* (*ὀτρηρὸς* being the Homeric epithet of *θεράπων*) might be read, so as to make the clause an epexegetis of *ἔτην*, which would thus be more directly contrasted with *πόλεως ἀγόν*. But the state of the MSS. reading *ἡτηρὸν ἡεροῦ* (al. *κέρου* or *έρμου*) *ράβδον*, renders all attempts at emendation extremely uncertain.

V. 247. In spite of Mr. Paley's reasoning, Canter's correction, *Πελασγός*, seems to us indisputable. To suppose, with Haupt, that the king intentionally avoids a direct mention of his name, is utterly gratuitous and unmeaning. In the very next line he states it plainly, not, as Mr. Paley says, 'satis ambigue:' the fact that he is elsewhere spoken of by other designations, looks like a mere accident, and is proved to be such by v. 987, the force of which cannot fairly be got rid of: and the only positive evidence for this intentional concealment, v. 915, is an exception which proves the rule, resting as it does on a special reason.

Πελασγοῦ γῆς, like Ἰνδοῦς γυναικας below, v. 280, which is merely an instance of the common confusion between *ov* and *a*, in our judgment is quite inadmissible. Ἕλλην appears to stand on different ground, being a masculine adjective with a single termination, not the masculine form of an adjective with three

V. 250. ἀγνός, J. Wordsworth's unquestionable emendation of Ἄλγος, mentioned by Dindorf in the preface to his new edition of Æschylus, does not seem to have been known to Mr. Paley. The discovery that τὸ, not τοῦ, was originally the Medicean reading for τε in the next line places it beyond doubt.

V. 262. We prefer Mr. Paley's μηνιτι, though a word occurring nowhere else, to the other alterations proposed for the old μηνεῖται. Dindorf's μηνιαῖ ἄκη is especially unhappy, the fancy of a monthly visitation being wholly unauthorized, and the word ἄκη inapplicable. Of the latter objection he has since become so far sensible that he now prints ἄχη. Perhaps in a third edition he will venture to depart yet further from the original, and read ἄρη, as he has substituted ἄγος for ἄχος in Agam. 1251, 1579.

V. 263. The mere run of the verse, so far as that can tell us what is likely to have been written by Æschylus, seems rather in favour of the old δράκονθ' ὄμιλον, which Mr. Paley now rejects. But it is difficult to find a parallel in defence of the expression: λεὼς ἱππότας, Theb. 80, perhaps comes nearest to it, as being a case of a noun of multitude joined with an adjectival substantive in the singular: but it may be questioned whether the word ἱππότας was not originally more of an adjective than a substantive.

V. 267. The MSS. reading πονταντινείσθον looks at first sight as if the word may once have been αἰμνηστον, but there can be no doubt that ἀντίμισθον is the right interpretation of the letters.

V. 268. It seems easier to believe, as Mr. Paley once did, that ἔχουσ' has been at one time or another corrupted into ἔχον δ', the text of Med., than, as he now does, that the king directs his question to Danaus, who is prevented from answering him by scenic considerations. The supposition that in v. 241, above, φθόγγος means ὁ φθεγγόμενος, the masculine *par excellence*, is, as far as we know, totally unsupported.

V. 281. Stanley's ἀστραβιζούσας ought to have been adopted, as without it there seems no reasonable construction for καμήλοις. The perverse readiness of transcribers to put a word in the same case with that which precedes it is well known.

V. 291. The reading of this line seems quite hopeless. We can hardly go wrong in correcting κοῦ for καὶ with Stanley. Κρυπτὰ ἦρας is a perfectly defensible construction, occurring in Soph. Elect. 159: but whether we prefer it to κρίβδα must

depend on our view of the rest of the line. Here *ταῦτα παλλαγμάτων* is the text of the MSS.: Turnebe filled up the vacancy with *τῶν*: others have endeavoured to supply it by altering *παλλάγματων*. *πάλλαγμα*, however, appears to be a better word than any of those which have been suggested in its room, being in strict analogy with *πάλλαξ*, *παλλακή*: so that if we do not accept *τῶν* we may suppose the fault to be in *ταῦτα*, for which we might have expected some verb like *ἔθιγε* in sense. The genitive termination looks genuine: too much so to allow us to see much probability in Mr. Paley's *ταῦτα παλλακεύματ' ἦν*. If it could be got rid of, we should prefer *ταῦτ' ἔτλη παλλάγματα*, supposing the verb to have been lost through the similarity of the letters.

V. 295. Mr. Paley's note convinces us that Schutz's *ἔτ'* is right.

V. 316. *πάνσοφον* is palpably wrong: nor does *πανσόφον*, which Mr. Paley receives from Tyrwhitt, appear to mend matters much. Schutz's *τὸ πᾶν σαφῶς* is better: but what force is there in the injunction to the Danaïdes to speak 'with perfect plainness?' It has occurred to us to read *πάντροφον*—not an unlikely word for the king to have used in reference to the father of the vast company which he saw before him, and confirmed by the way in which the Chorus give their answer, 'Danaus—and he has a brother who has also 50 children.' The epithet would naturally be used with *ὄνομα*, because the family would have to be spoken of by the patronymic when addressed as a whole. The old reading and interpretation of Theb. 294 may be adduced in support of this conjecture, even by those who prefer to read *πάντρομος*.

Vv. 331—3. The difficulties of these lines seem to us by no means to be as yet cleared up. We hardly see our way towards the adoption of Boissonade's *ὀνοῖτο*, plausible as it is, and accepted by the subsequent editors. As he remarks, the sense of v. 331 would then be '*κατ' ἐχθρὰν nempe*:' but this is scarcely to be reconciled with the express assertion of the Chorus in v. 37, and of Danaus in v. 221, that one at least of the preventing causes was *τὸ μὴ θέμις*: nor is there much force in v. 332, if taken as a remark upon such an answer. The old reading, *ὠνοῖτο*, is preferable, so far as it includes the notion of too close affinity among the objections to the marriage, *φίλος* being constantly used (*e. g.* in Cho. 234, Eum. 119) for relationship, without any reference to kind feeling: but the language would lead us to make *φίλους* the predicate and *τοὺς κεκτημένους* the subject rather than the reverse. To this it may perhaps be replied that *φίλους* may very well stand without the article, as in the passage from the Eumenides just quoted, Soph. Elect. 518, &c. &c.; while *κεκτημένος*, being a participle, requires the article to make it into a substantive even in the predicate. The king's

remark would then be an appeal to prudential considerations, and the rejoinder of the Chorus an endeavour to meet him on his own ground. In spite of Mr. Paley's altered judgment, *εὐμαρὴς ἀπαλλαγή* seems to us best explained by *ῥάδιοι ἀπαλλαγῇ*, Eur. Med. 1375; though the parallel would have been more exact had the plural been used here. At the same time, we neither take v. 333 ironically with Scholefield, nor understand *δυστυχούτων* of the husbands, with Mr. Paley in his first edition. The line need mean no more than, 'Yes; and it is no less true that the wretched can easily be got rid of.' If, following Schutz and Mr. Paley's second thoughts, we supposed the words to convey a reproach to the king, for the ease with which he settles the case of the unfortunate, we should not be able so well to account for the form of the answer, *καὶ—γε*.

V. 349. We can scarcely understand Mr. Paley's refusal to accept Bamberger's *νεύονθ'*, which he ought at any rate to have mentioned. The objection to taking *ῥμίλον* of the gods is little better than a cavil, and may at once be obviated by considering the use of *ῥμιλία*, Prom. 59, of two gods, Eum. 57, of goddesses, Eur. Hipp. 1441, of a goddess and a mortal. In the old reading, besides the harshness of *τε* in any case, which, though defensible by other instances, is not a thing to be embraced unnecessarily by a critic, there is the special impropriety of coupling two such attributes as that of being crowned with suppliant boughs and that of youth, the mention of the last of which would here be a mere impertinence.

V. 355. *γεραιόφρων*, Burges' correction of *γεραφρονῶν*, does not altogether answer to the strophe: *γεραρὰ φρονῶν*, or *γεραροφρονῶν* (if the latter may be introduced *pro hac vice*), would fulfil this requisite, and also approach nearer to the old text.

V. 370. We should prefer *τοῖς ἐμοὶ παλιγκότοις*, as otherwise *παλίγκοτος* must be taken as a substantive, like *ἔχθρος*—a use which there seems no authority for attributing to it. The passage from Pind. Nem. iv. *fn.* does not prove this.

V. 380. So far as the sense goes, Mr. Paley is right in preferring Porson's *δυσπαράθελκτοις* to Schutz's *δυσπαράθελκτος*, which, though, perhaps, countenanced by the Scholiast, would prevent our giving *μένει* its natural sense. But we would rather believe with Burges that *Æschylus* wrote *δυσπαράθελκτους* than that he did not care to avoid the confusion of datives, for which Agam. 426, if the text is sound, supplies a parallel, but not an excuse.

V. 388. The use of *ὀρίζομαι* is not rightly explained by Mr. Paley, '*mili eligo: proprie terminos statuo: deinde in universum definitio, faciendum mihi assigno.*' The word, if we mistake not, is used not in a universal, but in a special sense, and should be

closely connected with ὑπαστρον, in the manner already pointed out by the Scholiast, τὴν τοῦ γάμου μηχανὴν ὀριοῦμαι τοῖς ἀστροῖς. With this exception, we entirely agree with Mr. Paley's general view of the passage. In paraphrasing it, the important words would be, ὑπαστρον and δυσφρονος. 'I hate the marriage: and therefore it is that, as an expedient of escape, I throw myself on the guidance of the stars, and fly.'

V. 393. Under the circumstances, Mr. Paley has, perhaps, been well advised in retaining καὶ μήποτε, not as intrinsically preferable to Canter's μὴ καίποτε, or Wordsworth's κοῦ μήποτε, but as defensible, at the same time that it avoids the necessity of choosing between two evenly balanced conjectures. We have just before seen κοῦ confused with καὶ, v. 291.

V. 396. Mr. Paley explains and illustrates the use of τάδε as an adverbial, or rather cognate accusative—a construction apparently misunderstood by Dindorf, who records Bamberger's and Schutz's corrections of ἀμφοτέρους, thereby implying an opinion that some correction is necessary. We approve, too, of Mr. Paley's second thoughts in making ὁμαλίων an epithet of Ζεὺς. Compare Soph. Ant. 486, εἴθ' ὁμαιμονεστέρα τοῦ παντὸς ἡμῖν Ζηνὸς ἐρκεῖον κυρεῖ.

V. 403. We see no sufficient reason for suspecting ὥνωμένον. The eye that would penetrate a depth must not be giddy; and to connect giddiness with drunkenness is so common, as to need no illustration. Catullus expressly speaks of *ebrii ocelli*, the only difference being, that the giddiness there is the effect of passion. Mr. Paley's ἄνω μένον, an improvement on Boissonade's ἄνω μένειν, is much less forcible than ὥνωμένον, and objectionable, moreover, as containing an antithesis not to δεδορκός, which is its corresponding epithet, but to ἐς βυθὸν μολεῖν.

V. 425. Mr. Paley leaves the present verse as it stands, 'acquiescing gladly' in Klausen's correction ὁμοῖαν in the antistrophic v. 430. For our own part, we should prefer to leave the latter undisturbed; as, without entering on the question of the legitimacy of the Ionic form, we see no reason for spoiling the dochmiac metre. What to do with the former is by no means clear, as the words are perfectly good in themselves, independently of the metrical objection. Neither Seidler's experiment in quantity, nor Bothe or Bamberger's in language, seems to us satisfactory. Ἀμπύκων is too well chosen a word to be referable to a gloss or a corruption, otherwise we might read πλόκων, and thus complete the parallel with Theb. 328. In v. 429, Mr. Paley's improved judgment has led him to abandon ἄρ' ἐκτίνειν for Seidler's Ἀρεῖ κτίνειν. Bothe's original proposal, δόρι τίνειν, would answer more completely to the metre of the strophe; but we need not infringe on the customary latitude of dochmiacs.

Vv. 437—442. On the whole, we think that Dindorf has suggested the best way of dealing with this most difficult passage, by omitting altogether the two obnoxious lines, 438 and 442. Very little is gained by transposition: if v. 438 be placed after v. 439, it will be felt to be superfluous at best, not to mention the extreme uncertainty of the reading; if v. 441 and v. 442 change places, there is a surplusage of a similar kind, and *μη τὰ καίρια* has to be taken for *τὰ μὴ καίρια*. Mr. Paley adopts the latter remedy, but not the former, in the place of which he corrects v. 438 into *ἄτης τε μείζω καὶ μέγ' ἐμπλήσαι γέμος*, as if the adverbial use of *μέγα* constituted the main objection to the MSS. text. The Scholiast, as Dindorf remarks, appears to have found in his copy *ἄτης γεμίζων καὶ μέγ' ἐμπλήσας γόμον*, and this would seem to be the most probable reading, if we look merely to the line itself. We may suppose then, that it came somehow to be inserted in the margin from another place, perhaps by a person who recollected the parallel passage, Agam. 1008; thence it might slip into the text, when *γε μείζω* would be the obvious correction of an unskilful critic. If we apply a similar hypothesis to v. 442, we may say that its introduction was probably owing to certain verbal parallels between it and the lines before and after, e.g. the word *κάρτα*, the verbal *κινήτρια*, compared with *θελκτήριος* and *χρηστήρια*, and perhaps *θυμοῦ*, which may point to a various reading of *μύθον* in v. 441. Reverting to a minor point, we agree with Mr. Paley in retaining *χρήμασιν—πορθομένων*, in v. 437, as Æschylus in many other places shows an unaccountable fondness for the genitive absolute, when he might have been expected to put the participle in some other case.

V. 450. We had thought of reading *ἀκούσομαι λέγοις ἄν*: but Wakefield's *χὰ λέγοις ἄν* seems more likely. Mr. Paley keeps the common reading without a word.

V. 460. May not *μακιστήρ* have been an arrow of unusual length, as our old writers talk of a *cloth-yard shaft*?

V. 462. *πολλαχῇ* looks genuine, though *καὶ—μὴν* would be better than *καὶ—μὲν*. On the whole, we think Mr. Paley's suspicions of the text as he has given it unreasonable.

V. 473. We doubt exceedingly the propriety of turning these words, with Mr. Paley, into a general reflection. Not only the use of the word *ὑψιστος*, but the introduction of the sentiment itself seems to us unnatural—the invention of a modern, not the thought of an ancient. *Φόβος* we take as an 'object of terror,' as if it had been written *ὑψιστον σέβας*, the subject being *Ζεὺς ἰκτῆρ*, or, *ὁ Διὸς ἰκτῆρος κότος*.

V. 474. It does not seem necessary to read *σὺ μὴν* with Mr. Paley. There is nothing unheard of in the occurrence of *μὲν* without its corresponding *δέ*, especially when, as he admits, the

apodosis may be so easily understood, αἱ δὲ ἐνταῦθα μενόντων. Κλάδους τε, too, we think genuine, though we should not seek to explain it by connecting the clause with μηδ' ἀπορρίφθῃ λόγος, which apparently belongs to the preceding words ὥς ἴδωσι. We have already, on v. 52, alluded to the Æschylean use of τε with a verb after a participle; and the fact, that in the present sentence τε precedes the participle, need not prevent us from regarding this as a case of the same kind, since, by placing a comma after ταύτους, we may make the construction equivalent to λαβὲ θές τε, or λαβὼν εἶτα θές. Μηδ' ἀπορρίφθῃ λόγος ἐμοῦ we prefer on the whole to understand with Bothe, 'and that no word of me may be let fall,' as the sense thus seems best to accord with the words which follow. It may be a question whether ἐμοῦ is to be constructed with λόγος, and not rather with ἀπορρίφθῃ, after the analogy of the genitive after βάλλειν, ἵεναι, and other words mentioned in Jelf, Gr. Gr. § 506.

V. 480. Linwood's correction, οἰκτίσας, ἰδὼν τάδε, strikes us as much more probable than ἵκτορ' εἰσιδὼν, which, though no longer holding a place in Mr. Paley's text, is still approved in his notes.

V. 485. How a man of Mr. Paley's judgment can hesitate about admitting Porson's εὐρεθέντα is to us a matter of astonishment. The defences that have been set up for εὐ ρέοντα will not bear a moment's examination. 'Ρέω, meaning 'to flow,' does not appear to be connected in any way with the root of εἴρηκα. It is applied metaphorically to speech, to the organs of speech, and sometimes, though rarely, to the speaker—the object being to express in each case the attribute which we distinguish by the corresponding name of *fluency*. But it is obvious that Danaus here does not mean to call the king his *fluent* patron, even if the metaphor, which is not so completely naturalized in Greek as in English, were admissible in a passage where no particular stress is laid on the epithet: and to say that εὐ ρεῖν can be used of the goodness of a speech relatively to its matter, is as reasonable as it would be to assert that the verb *to flow* is with us convertible with the verb *to speak*.

V. 492. We do not see the reason for exchanging φόβον for φόνον. Danaus says, that ill-judged confidence may issue in alarm, for men have been known to put their friends to death in ignorance. The sense is perfectly clear without the alteration, which might be objected to as stating the speaker's apprehension too plainly, and as anticipating the more direct language of the next line.

V. 502. Mr. Paley has at length succeeded in reconciling the two senses of λευρός, which he now renders, 'latus et apertus.' He still appears, however, to have some difficulty in applying the

epithet to ἄλσος, remarking, that a place overgrown with trees could not be called level and open. We would refer him to Mr. Stanley's explanation of the word in his article on Greek Topography in the Classical Museum (vol. i. p. 65), where he speaks of it as 'a natural τέμενος, a retired basin in the bosom of the mountains, interspersed but never overgrown with trees'—the Latin *saltus*, in short, and proceeds to show its peculiar applicability to the plain of Marathon.

V. 507. We can scarcely doubt that Bothe, in his first edition, was right in reading φρένας, though the conjecture is not mentioned by Mr. Paley.

V. 508. We prefer Schutz's interpretation, 'the fear of kings is ever excessive.' The sentiment may be supported from Persæ 694, *sqq.*, though the language there is much stronger, corresponding to the difference between an Asiatic despotism and an European monarchy, such as this of Pelasgus is described to be. Of course, the fear here felt is not simply of the person of the king; but it is true, nevertheless, that the distance between the monarch and the suppliant constitutes one reason why the latter should hesitate to rely on the assurances of the former. Linwood's γυναικῶν, however, may be worth considering.

V. 509. If a correction be needed, φρένα seems more natural than φρενοῦ, in spite of Mr. Paley's remark that the former would hardly have been corrupted into φρενὶ—an objection which assumes a greater uniformity in the laws of textual corruption than we are at present prepared to admit. But we do not wholly give up φρενὶ, which may be taken either with εὐφραϊνε or with πρᾶσσων. The difficulty is, that it does not seem to cohere very naturally with a verb expressing action: a case in point, however, is Cho. 303, and perhaps 1004.

V. 521. In his first edition, Mr. Paley appeared to have taken γενέσθω under his patronage, mainly because other parts of the verb had been unfairly used in other passages of Æschylus. He now admits the probability of Lobeck's γένει σῶ, which before had only obtained from him the praise of being 'ingenious.' We should make little question about adopting it, our doubt, if any, arising wholly from the existence of a rival conjecture, γενέθλω, and in no way from any consideration which can be adduced in favour of the old reading.

V. 525. Here Mr. Paley is plainly right. Τὸ πρὸς γυναικῶν comes in after ἀνδρῶν, v. 522, as naturally as words can, in spite of Dindorf's dogmatic 'γυναικῶν vocabulum corruptum.'

V. 527. We are surprised that Mr. Paley, constructing γένος with νέωσον, should call it an accusative in opposition to αἶνον. The construction is clearly the same as in Soph. Elect. 124, *sqq.* τάκεις οἰμωγὰν . . . Ἀγαμέμνονα—a construction difficult to

analyse exactly, but explained sufficiently for practical purposes by the *πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον* principle, which would make *νέωσον αἶνον* = *αἶνει*, just as there *τάκεις οἰωγὰν* = *οἰμώξεις*.

V. 529. Mr. Paley should, at any rate, have mentioned Hermann's *πολυμνήστορ* for *πολυμνήτωρ*, a reading adopted by Dindorf so long ago as his first edition on metrical grounds, and altogether strongly supported by critical probability.

V. 530. We leave the metrical question between *δι' ἄς* and *δίας*, to be argued out between Dindorf and Mr. Paley, merely remarking that, *cæteris paribus*, we should be glad to be spared the construction proposed by the latter, *εὐχόμεθα γένος ἀπὸ τᾶσδε εἶναι, ἔνοικοι δίας γᾶς*, which it is evident that nothing less than violence could have extorted from the Greek.

V. 533. If *ἐπωπᾶς* is to be defended, it must be on the ground taken by Mr. Paley, 'the watchings of Io' being considered equivalent to 'the places where Io was watched;' but this does not quite satisfy us, though we have no correction to suggest.

V. 535. Mr. Paley's *ἐρεθομένα* is in itself as good a substitution for *ἐρεσσομένα* as could be wished. We should at once pronounce it right, were it not that the similarity of the metre of this line, according to the old reading, to that of the next, creates a probability that it is rather the antistrophe which requires change.

V. 546. 'Libri Παμφύλων τε γένη. Corruptus est hic versus, 'Παμφύλων enim non respondet strophico v. neque credibile est 'scripsisse poetam Παμφυλίων.' The metre would be restored by reading Παφλαγόνων, which would further account for the intrusive γένη; but Io is more likely to have traversed Pamphylia than Paphlagonia, and it would be too much to suppose that Παμφύλων γένη was introduced by some copyist who felt the geographical difficulty. Possibly Παφλαγόνων may have been a various reading for Παμφυλίων, or Παμφύλων, and γένη may have crept in through the confusion; or γένη may be a gloss for φύλα, a word which, with its epithet, may have been corrupted into Παμφύλων. But speculation is useless in a case like this.

V. 554. We think Mr. Paley right in adopting, as he now does, Schutz's *ὑδωρ τε Νείλου*, so as to make *τυφῶ μένος* the nominative, as the typhoon is one of the natural phenomena of Egypt. At the same time *μένος* would make a perfectly good and appropriate construction after *ἐπέρχεται*, as he remarks, though he does not explain that it would then be a cognate accusative.

V. 556. Mr. Paley deserves credit for seeing that *κεντροδαλήτοις* should be *κεντροδάλητος*, *θυιάς* being a corruption of some word beginning with a vowel, of the quantity - - -. We do not,

however, like his *ἔθνευ*, though we have not been able to think of anything better.

V. 561. Mr. Paley has silently changed the punctuation of his first edition so as to connect *ὄψιν ἀήθη* with *πάλλουντ'* rather than with *ἑσορῶντες*. The construction is thus rendered less obvious, but more idiomatic, being, in fact, substantially the same as that noticed just above on v. 528.

V. 570. *Βία* does not seem to refer so much to the violence inflicted on Io from without, as to her own frenzied wildness. This yields a proper antithesis between *βία* and *ἀπημάντω σθένει*, which answers to *ἀταρβεί χειρὶ*, Prom. 849, (a line unaccountably called in question by Dindorf.) Compare also v. 92 above, *Βίαν δ' οὐτῶν' ἐξοπλίζει*, well rendered by Mr. Blackie, 'No force he wields; his simple will, His quiet sentence blasteth.'

V. 586. Mr. Paley proposes to complete this line by reading *αὐτόχειρ πάντων ἀναξ*. The antistrophic v. 591 makes it more probable that the deficiency is to be supplied by inserting a dactyl at the beginning.

V. 589. On this disputed passage we are happy to agree with Mr. Paley. Buttman appears to us to have established satisfactorily the sense of *θαάζειν*, and the context here clearly requires the notion of *sitting*. The same considerations determine the sense of *τὸ μείον κρείσσονων κρατύνει*, which must refer to Zeus' exercise of his own power; not, as Dindorf thinks, to his promotion of the weak above the strong. We see no occasion either to follow Dindorf in his hasty and ill-advised condemnation of v. 591, where the genitive absolute instead of the accusative after the verb is quite in the manner of Æschylus.

V. 594. Here we prefer Dindorf's punctuation, connecting *τὰ τῶν ἐγχωρίων* with *θαρσεῖτε*, as more idiomatic than either of the two successively adopted by Mr. Paley.

V. 600. *Ὡστ'*, the reading of the Med. MS. and Robortelli, makes, as Mr. Paley remarks, strongly for Tyrwhitt's *ἀνηβῆσαι* *με*. At the same time we agree with him that the construction of the old reading, *ὥς ἂν ἡβῆσαιμι*, is perfectly good, though less usual. He goes on to state his opinion on the subject at some length in an Excursus to which we on the whole subscribe, at the same time that we think some of his distinctions unnecessary. Our view is simply this. *Ὡς*, as the adverb of the relative, properly means, 'in which manner.' In independent clauses, it introduces a comparison, or analogy of some kind, not only with the indicative, but with other words. Thus *ὅπως*, which follows the same rule, is used in Ag. 363 with the optative and *ἂν*, merely to express a comparison, while *ὥς* performs a similar office with the conjunctive and *ἂν* in Eum. 33. In subjoined clauses, *ὥς* and *ὅπως* express either a result or a purpose; but

they do so, not from any change in their own meaning, but simply because the clause is subjoined, and the moods are used in a different sense from that which they would bear in an independent sentence. Accordingly, there are cases where, even in translating subjoined clauses, something more of the original adverbial force requires to be brought out than appears in the ordinary renderings 'that,' or 'in order to.' So, if we retain *ὥς ἂν ἡβήσαιμ* in the present line, we shall find that *ὥς* gains a peculiar propriety by being viewed in connexion with *διχορρόπως*, 'The decision was given in no equivocal manner, but in such a manner as to make a young man of me.' What is the force of *ἂν* is another question with which we need not meddle, though we confess to a suspicion that its presence or absence makes no difference in the sense of a conditional clause, it being not the cause of the contingency, but the sign of one already existing, just as propositions are rightly said not to determine but to indicate the case or relation of the noun.

V. 611. This passage has been generally despaired of; but, in spite of the tone of diminished confidence in which Mr. Paley now speaks, we think that he has removed all difficulty by reading *προφωνῶν* with Canter, and rendering *παχύναι* 'sinere ditescere.' He has not remarked, however, on the confirmation which this reference to the Herodotean sense of *οἱ παχεῖς* receives from the word *βόσκημα* in v. 614. The disease is to be a drain on the body politic, exhausting its powers of support, and preventing it from thriving or becoming fat. Cf. Soph. Phil. 313, *Βόσκων τὴν ἀδηφάγον νόσον*. Ib. 1167. *Οἰκτρά γὰρ βόσκειν, ἀδαῆς δ' ἔχειν μυρίον ἄχθος, ᾧ ξυνοικεῖ*.

V. 620. *Ἀγαθὸν ποινὰς* is not in opposition to *εὐχὰς*, but a cognate after *λέγωμεν*. Cf. Prom. 563, *τίνος ἀμπλακίας ποινὰς ὀλέκει*;

Vv. 626, 627. These lines appear to us more difficult than many on which the commentators have bestowed more labour. That *τὸν ἄχορον βοὰν* is to be construed with Mr. Paley, 'Cujus clamor non talis est ad quem choreæ ducantur,' we cannot believe; and Bothe's attempt to connect *βοὰν μάχλον*, 'impotentem inconditi clamoris,' is still less likely. To us, we confess, it seems clear that *βοὰν κτίσαι* ought to be taken together; and in that case, both the general aspect of the present passage, and the metre of the antistrophe, would lead us to suspect further that *τὸν* should be *τὰν*, so as to make *ἄχορον* an epithet of *βοὰν*. Thus the shouting of Ares, which leads to no dancing, will become the primary image in the passage; and the epithet *μαχλὸς*, which doubtless was intended to convey the notion of wanton revelry, will acquire a fresh propriety. But then, what is to be done with v. 626? *Πυρίφατον* seems a genuine word, or

we might suppose the first part of it to have been originally *περὶ*, whatever the second may have been, and compare *περιβόητος*, the epithet of Ares in Soph. Œd. T. 192. Keeping the existing reading, we must apparently have recourse to the hypothesis of a construction like that noticed on v. 527, *κτίσαι βοᾶν πόλιν* being a sufficiently good parallel to *τάκειν οἰμωγὰν Ἀγαμέμνονα*. In any case it appears that *πυρίφατον* must be taken as what we have elsewhere called, after Dr. Donaldson, a tertiary predicate, at least by those who accept, as we are inclined to do, Bamberger's correction of *πράκτορά τε σκοπὸν*, v. 635, into *πράκτορ ἄτης κότον*, and are thus compelled to believe that the MSS. are right in inserting *τὰν* here before *Πελασγίαν*, or *Πελασγὰν πόλιν*.

V. 628. We are quite satisfied with the interpretation which makes *ἄλλοις* mean 'other and worse,' or 'unnatural,' as most in accordance not only with the poetical use of *ἄλλος*, or *ἕτερος*, but with the poetical custom of 'coercing,' or qualifying a metaphor, explained by Aristot. Rhet. iii. 6. Mr. Paley's former view, that the verse expresses a wish, is irreconcilable with the words *τὸν θερίζοντα*. His present opinion, that the line is intended to convey a hint, 'he is reaping in other fields, let him stay there,' may stand on grounds of language; but the sense which it gives is inferior in point of force, as it strikes us, to that which we have ventured to prefer.

V. 637. We entirely assent to Mr. Paley's remark, 'Recte explicari non emendari, debebat hic locus,' and trust it may be understood as a rebuke to the dogmatism of Dindorf, who says of *μαίνοντα* in his notes, 'lectio absurda, probabiliter (!) correcta ab Schuetzio, qui *κοταίνοντα* conjecit.' The two passages cited by Mr. Paley sufficiently prove that *μιάστωρ*=*ἀλάστωρ*: and he might have gone on to show that one of them (Eum. 176) has yet a further point of resemblance to the one before us, as *ἐν κάρᾳ* answers exactly to *ἐπ' ὀρόφων*. That this is not an accidental coincidence will appear, if we refer to another place where this use of *μιάστωρ* occurs, Eur. Med. 1371. *Οἷδ' εἰσὶν οἶμοι* (or more probably *οἶμαι*, after Bothe), *σὺ κάρᾳ μιάστωρες*. We may be ignorant of the exact force of the expression, which may, perhaps, be susceptible of illustration from such passages as Soph. Elect. 445; but we cannot doubt that it had some peculiar propriety, and that the connexion here assumed between the top of a building and a polluting presence is anything but fortuitous.

V. 652. In Agam. 722, as in Eur. Supp. 42, we understand *γεραρός* as it is generally understood, of old age: but that does not seem a sufficient reason why we should give it that sense here, where it would be less convenient. It appears to mean

both 'aged' and 'honourable,' a natural connexion in the Greek mind, as Dr. Donaldson remarks, though he will not let the passage in the Agamemnon have the full benefit of it; hence, when it comes to be used substantively in the neuter plural, the sense of 'honours' or 'gifts' is clearly that which is to be expected. We also think Mr. Paley justified in adopting *γερόντων* for *γεμόντων*, from Bothe, and in restoring *τῶς* for *θ' ὥς* from the MSS.

V. 658. Mr. Paley ought, we think, to have adopted Ahrens' easy and simple correction, *δὲ φόρους γὰς*. The MSS. authority in such cases is worth nothing; while the new reading is decidedly more natural than the old, and besides introduces a characteristic opposition between *φόροι γὰς* and *γυναικῶν λόχοι*.

V. 667. As Mr. Paley is now clear as to the truth of *κρατὸς* here, and of *μοῦσαν θέλει* in the antistrophe (the corrections respectively of Voss, Ahrens, and Hermann, none of them admitting of a doubt), we do not see why he should have wasted a word in attempting to explain *κράτους*, though the reading which he formerly adopted.

V. 678. Butler's correction, *ἀτρεμαῖα* for *ἀτιμίας* (followed by Mr. Paley), is ingenious, agreeing as it does with the gloss *ἀσφαλίας* and with the explanation of the Scholiast. We do not, however, greatly like the sense thus produced—'populus servet sc. honoret magistratus, h. e. ne in *ἀναρχίαν* ruat.' To us it seems as if the *κοινόμεντις ἀρχὰ* referred rather to the king, who, as he told us above, v. 363, acts after communication with the citizens. *Τὸ δῆμιον* then will be the accusative after *φύλασσοι*, the king being bidden to protect the people, wherein the strength of the state lies. For *ἀτιμίας τιμὰς*, we should propose to read *αἰσίμαισι τιμαῖς*,—a very easy correction, and yielding a perfectly good meaning. Cf. Eum. 996. *χαίρετε χαίρετ' ἐν αἰσιμαῖσι πλούτου*. The precise reading of v. 680 cannot well be ascertained, on account of the uncertainty of the antistrophe; but we see no objection to *προμαθεὺς εὐ κοινόμεντις*.

V. 694. The case of *λανθάνειν* seems to be like that of *τυγχάνειν*—viz. that it generally takes a participle, but sometimes dispenses with it. Otherwise we might break up the line by a fresh punctuation: *εὐσημον γὰρ, οὐ με λανθάνει*.

V. 698. Scholefield and Mr. Paley are clearly right against Peile (Agam. p. 139), who, independently of any question about his view of the language of the passage, appears to have mistaken the sense. His rendering is 'too well obeying the rudder for an unfriendly one;' where, if he means 'unfriendly to us,' the impression produced by his construction is directly contrary to that intended by Æschylus; if 'unfriendly to the rudder,' the general sense is preserved, but a less obvious signification is forced on the words.

V. 707—713. Mr. Paley has silently returned to the order of these lines as it stands in the common editions, having before adopted an arrangement of his own, according to which the whole was given to Danaus, except v. 709, the one line of all others which most undoubtedly belongs to him both in sense and in language. With regard, however, to the words *εἰ βραδύνοιμεν βοῇ* he suggested a real difficulty, which he cannot be held to have solved by his present note, '*Βοῇ. Schol. τῇ βοηθείᾳ.*' The sense must be, not 'if we are slow in getting aid,' a questionable rendering, and implying a contingency of which Danaus, being away, could know nothing; nor 'if we are slow in crying out,' a supposition ridiculous on the face of it, though more easily extracted from the words; but 'if we are slow in bringing succour;'—and this being so, it follows that the line must be spoken by Danaus, who recommends his daughters to cling to the gods in case assistance should be delayed. But we have no doubt that the whole passage really belongs to Danaus from first to last, in spite of the MSS.—a point which surely will be plain to any one who considers the words of the chorus, v. 714. To speak as they do there they must have been silent hitherto—not interrupting with querulous objections, but brooding over their father's warning, and finally breaking out with a lyrical burst of terror, which would lose all its force if it were not their first utterance. There is nothing in the lines preceding to militate against this conviction, but much to confirm it: γὰρ in v. 707 is thus shown to have its proper force, and Mr. Paley's γ' ἂν appears as unwarrantable in sense as it is unnecessary in language. In v. 709, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἔσται τῶνδε does not mean 'the herald will not come,' but 'he will not accomplish his purpose,' a translation according well with μὴ τρέσητέ νυν. The credit of this discovery, if indeed it presented itself to them in that light, seems to be due to the Aldine editor and Turnèbe, who have been followed by some of the commentators, though without any detailed reasons assigned. Mr. Blackie trusts to his translation to make it evident that the view he has taken is the right one—and it does so.

V. 724. Mr. Paley bids us connect ὃδ' ἐπιτυχεῖ, i.e. as he construes in his former edition, 'which has thus proved successful.' If we followed him, we should rather take the words to mean, 'which has reached this place.' But the run of the verse shows unmistakably that ὃδ' is to be constructed with ἐπλευσαν.

V. 725. We see no reason for suspecting πολεῖ. In spite of Dindorf's assertion, it seems to be sufficiently defended by the forms πολέα and πολέων, and there is an evident reference to it in πολλοὺς in the next line.

V. 735. Mr. Paley has omitted his former explanation, 'θεῶν

σέβη sunt aræ.' From being coupled with τριαίνας, the words seem as if they might rather mean the *offices* or *functions* of the gods. But the plural form is so rare as to be doubtful, and ἔδη would be a very easy correction.

V. 743. Ἐχοντας is doubtless the right reading, coming after ὥς. Κράτος appears to us clearly to be a cognate, or, what is the same thing, an adverbial accusative, like τάχος.

V. 744. The use of στολή here, compared with that of στόλος, v. 240, may almost tempt us to suppose that the two can, in some cases at least, be employed convertibly, like ὄχθη and ὄχθος, and perhaps τριβή and τρίβος.

V. 749. Mr. Paley cannot understand how Dindorf (following, it should be mentioned, a suggestion of Bamberger) can propose to remove the full stop from after χθόνα to after ἡλίου, unless μολόντες be taken as a 'nominativus pendens.' The case is perfectly clear: μολόντες follows its old construction with ποιμένες, v. 747, and the only difference is that the clause ἐς νύκτ' ἀποστείχοντος ἡλίου is taken from a connexion where it would only create a pleonasm, and placed in one where it is really wanted to supply an additional thought. The words φιλεῖ κ.τ.λ. will then form a general statement, subjoined *more Tragicorum* to enforce the particular point just mentioned. The alteration, we are convinced, is one which might occur to any one considering the passage with attention: indeed, it occurred to us before we observed it in Dindorf's notes.

V. 756. Βοῦνι πάνδικον for the corrupt βουνίτι ἐνδικον seems a good correction, though we are not sure that the hiatus is an objection to Dindorf's reading.

V. 761. Haupt's αἴστος looks plausible, and would be something more if the remainder of the old text ἀμπετήσαις δόσωσ could be settled with any sort of certainty. It can hardly be doubted that some part of ἀναπέτομαι is the word required, both by the sense and by the traces of the MSS.; but neither Mr. Paley's ἀμπετεῖς (an unknown aorist), nor his ἀμπετής (a word which, as he sees himself, could only come from πίπτω) can be said to supply the want. Whether αἴστος or αἰστος be the reading must depend on the antistrophe, where there is a similar choice between χριμφθῆναι and χριμφθῆν, a correction of Dindorf's.

V. 764. We cannot believe that Æschylus meant to say, 'My heart can no longer abide without flying,' especially as he goes on immediately to speak of the heart as undergoing a different process. Much more probable is Bothe's πέλοιτο κῆρ (after Schutz's πέλοι γε), the corruption of which would be accounted for by supposing κῆρ to have been blundered into κέαρ by a transcriber who took it for κῆρ, leaving the change into πέλοι to

follow as a matter of course. In that case it would be better to alter *ἄφυκτον* into *ἄφυκτος*.

V. 766. Mr. Paley had a note on *πατρὸς σκοπαί*, which he now omits, as though it were no longer wanted. Yet the words are not easy. His conclusion, that the Scholiast is right in paraphrasing *προσκοπήσας ὁ πατήρ καὶ σημάνας ἐτάραξεν*, seems on the whole the safest, as there is nothing unnatural in making the chorus charge their ruin on the discoverer of the danger. *σκοπαί*, however, might stand for the thing seen—the ship to wit—which would bear the blame with more justice.

V. 770. Whether *χριμφθῆν* or *χριμφθῆναι* be right, we gladly accept *χροὶ* for *χεροῖν* from Dindorf and Boissonade.

V. 774. We question whether Porson's transposition of *χιῶν* and *νέφη* can be accepted as a restoration. It is something undoubtedly to have got rid of *δὲ*, which seems impracticable: but *πρὸς ὃν* still remains to cause a difficulty. Turnèbe's *δι' ὕδρηλά* would be better, 'on which the snow falls through the watery clouds,' if the metrical objection could be removed, as it might by reading *δι' ὕγρὰ*, a conjecture which we fancy we have seen elsewhere. But it is impossible to speak with any confidence.

V. 777. *Μακιστήρα καρδίας*, in v. 460, seems to show that *δαίκτορος καρδίας* are to be taken together here.

V. 786. This line and the next seem to have been tampered with beyond the possibility of conjectural remedy. Without attempting a complete restoration, therefore, we will just suggest that *ἀμφ' αὐτὰς* may have been originally *φυγάς*, and *τέμνω* the Homeric *τέμνω*, which occurs in the conjunctive *Od. xv. 15*.

V. 789. The antistrophic v. 797 shows that we ought to transpose the present line into *θεοῖσι μέλη λίτανα καί*. Mr. Paley saw this in his first edition, though he unaccountably wished to omit the last word: now he wishes to read *καὶ λιτάνευε θεοὺς*, a proposal which deviates widely from the text, without, as far as we can see, restoring the metre. Of the next words we confess we can make nothing. It is singular that they bear at least a verbal resemblance to another perplexed line, (v. 115), *θεοῖς δ' ἐναγέα τέλεα, πελομένων καλῶς*: but the parallel has not helped us either to an explanation or an emendation.

V. 791. Both Schutz's *λύσιμα γάμον* and Mr. Paley's *λύσιμα μάχην* seem good, though they proceed on irreconcilable hypotheses; the one connecting *λύσιμα* with what follows, the other with what goes before. If the former be the true view of the context, we might read *λυσιμαχά μοι δ' ἔπιδε*, 'look to a way of ending strife,' *μοι* being preserved partly in the termination *μάχιμα*, partly in its own shape, twice over in the previous line. The chief obstacle is in the quantity of the first syllable, but the

instances of *λυσιπαίμων* and *λυσιπήμων* seem to show that it may occasionally be shortened, apparently as being derived from *λύσις*. *Λύσιμα* itself is to all appearance in a similar predicament; analogy pleads for lengthening the vowel, though there seems to be no very direct authority for the poetical use of the word; but the metre proves that it must be short. The reception of *μὴ φίλοις* (Lachmann) in the next verse, is an act of tardy justice on Mr. Paley's part: he had formerly kept the old reading, *φιλεῖς*, which he wished to connect with *ὄρων* = *ὄραν*. Perhaps, however, *μὴ φίλως* would be a still further improvement.

Vv. 804—887. After all that Mr. Paley and Dr. Donaldson (New Cratylus, ed. 2. § 475) have done for this scene, it continues to justify the sentence passed by Dindorf, 'Hæc pars fabulæ tam male habita est ut de vitiis plerisque ne conjecturæ quidem probabilis locus sit.' We rather shrink from meddling with it, as we have scarcely anything to offer ourselves, even in the way of guesswork: but it may be worth while just to see how much or how little has been effected, or may be effected, by criticism.

V. 804. We see no reason why Mr. Paley should have given these singular exclamations to the Herald rather than to the Chorus, to whose expressions of terror they form a natural introduction: nor why he and all other editors should have printed them without the breathings to which they are entitled as initial vowels. As to the rest of this speech, with the exception of *καβ-βάς* for *κάκκας*, nothing satisfactory, or even plausible, has been suggested. We observe that Dindorf, in his new edition, prints the first part as follows, *ὅδε μάρπτis | νάιος | γάιος | τῶν πρὸ μάρπτi κάμνοis | ἰδφ ὅμ | αὐθi κάκκας | νν*. If, as we suppose, this division of the lines is taken from the Med. MS. the natural conclusion would be that the passage is mutilated rather than corrupt.

V. 817. The authority of the Scholiast is scarcely a sufficient warrant for Mr. Paley's transference of these lines to the Herald. *Οὐκοῦν* cannot be called an exact equivalent of *εἰ δὲ μὴ*, and a speech from the Chorus appears to be what is wanted, though the enumeration of tortures suits the Herald, perhaps, rather better.

V. 821. We are by no means sure that it is necessary to adopt *ἄμαλα*. The Etymologicon Magnum may be right in preserving *ἀμάδα*, which is nearer to the *ἀμίδα* of the MSS.; and Hesychius' gloss, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀμᾶν τὴν ἄλα*, may mean no more than that he derived *ἀμὰς* from *ἀμᾶν*. As will be seen, in the absence of evidence, we follow Hermann in assuming the penult to be long. Dobree's *ἀλῖαδα*, which Donaldson adopts, may, however, be worth consideration.

V. 822. From this line the correspondence of strophe and antistrophe begins to be traceable. Vv. 822—825, 833—836

clearly answer to each other, if we adopt, as no one now will hesitate to do, Hermann's διώλου for δι' ὅλου in v. 825—and thus the metrical relation of the remaining lines is a matter of inference. Both metre and language, however, are in themselves doubtful to the last degree. Mr. Paley, following Dr. Donaldson, has been able to effect an arrangement which in some measure satisfies both, but it bears too much the mark of being *pro re natâ*, at the same time that it involves considerable departure from the corrupt MSS. text. In the attempt which we subjoin, the changes introduced are still more violent: but the result, utterly unauthorized as we confess it to be, seems to us more like what Æschylus might have written. As such, and as such alone, we venture to put it forward.

στροφή.
KH. αἴμονα σ' ἐπ' ἀμάδα θήσω 826
τρόπον δραπέτα.
κελεύω βίᾳ μεθέσθαι
ἴχαρ ~ ~ ~ ~
φρενῶν ἰὼν ἰὼν.
λείψ' ἔδραν, κί' ἐπὶ δόρυ'
ἂ τίτ' ἄμ πόλιν οὐ σέβω.

ἀντιστροφή.
KH. ἄγρια σ' ἄγω βαθυχαίταν 837
ἐθείρας χερσίν.
σὺ δ' ἐν ναὶ ναὶ βάσει
τάχα θελεὸς ἀθέλεος
βίᾳ βοᾷ τε πολλῇ.
βᾶθι μὴ προκακοπαθεῖν
ῥομένα παλάμαις ἐμαῖς.

In v. 832 we have adopted Mr. Paley and Prof. Scholefield's reading: in v. 843, Dr. Donaldson's. The other alterations are our own—most of them, as we are aware, far overpassing the ordinary limits of conjecture, and at best entitled merely to a provisional existence, till something as plausible, and nearer to the original, has been struck out. The main advantage of the proposal, as it seems to us, is that it affords a tolerably natural escape from the cardinal difficulty of the common text, which puts strophe and antistrophe into the mouths of different speakers. With μεθέσθαι ἰὼν, compare Eum. 782, ἰὼν ἀντιπενθῇ μεθεῖσα: with φρενῶν ἰὼν, Ag. 834, δύσφρων γὰρ ἰὼς καρδίαν προσήμενος: with ἄγω σε ἐθείρας, below v. 882, ἔλξειν ἀποσπᾶσας κόμης, and Eur. Iph. Aul. 1365, ἄξει δ' οὐχ ἐκούσαν ἀρπάσας; δηλαδὴ ξανθῆς ἐθείρης.

V. 836. It is surprising that the editors, some of whom have found a difficulty in this line (Bamberger suggesting οἶδμα for αἶμα, as Pearson had suggested νᾶμα), should not have seen that βροτοῖσι is an error for βοτοῖσι, and that the clause ἔνθεν—θάλλει is an exact explanation of the epithet ἀλφεσίβοιον, which Mr. Paley rightly renders 'quod boves nutrit ac pinguefacit.'

V. 848. Both of Mr. Paley's emendations, πολὺψαμμον and εὐπείαισιν appear certain. The former was obvious enough: but the latter is a real instance of critical success. The reading of the Med. MS., εὐρυχωρείας, is easily accounted for by supposing the transcriber's eye to have wandered to the word χῶμα in the previous line.

V. 852. *Χέων νόμον*, or *νόμον χέων*, is likely enough. Like Mr. Paley, however, we hesitate a little at the gender, thinking with him that Danaus is plainly off the stage. There seems nothing for it but an *Enallage numeri*: but the uncertainty of the rest of the line makes this doubtful.

V. 854. Mr. Paley's reading, *ἄγρια γὰρ σὺ λάσκεις*, was originally proposed by Dr. Donaldson in a note on his edition of the *Antigone*, though he now prefers to read *ἄβροτα*. To us it seems more probable that the original text should have been *λυμαντῆς ὑπὸ γᾶς ὑλάσκει*, or something of the sort, the allusion being to the barking of Cerberus. Compare v. 871 below, where there is a similar mention of the Herald in the third person instead of a direct address. We have nothing to propose for *περιχαμπτᾶ*, though we do not believe in *περιχυμπτᾶ* any more than Mr. Paley. In the next line he has made a correction which we are happy to speak of as beyond doubt—*ὃ σε θρέψας* for *ὃς ἐρωτᾶς*—thus restoring the very words which the sense would have led us most to expect, at the expense of a change which those acquainted with palæography will acknowledge to be more than probable.

V. 861. Both strophe and antistrophe appear to us hopeless. If we were required to bring them into correspondence, we should be disposed to assume that the original antitype of v. 862 was *μαιμᾶ πέλας δίπους ὄφεις*, the words *οἰοὶ πάτερ* having been accidentally omitted in the antistrophe. But we find it impossible to arrive even at a proximate conclusion as to the true reading. Here, as in v. 791 above, we take *πάτερ* to be an address to Zeus, not to Danaus. Consequently it seems likely that *βρότειος* or *βρότειος*, rather than *βρέτειος*, should be the reading in the following line, in spite of the Scholiast. Compare v. 96, *ιδέσθω δ' εἰς ὕβριν βρότειον*. Looking to the context, however, we think that it is not the outrageousness of human violence, but the tardiness of human aid which Zeus is here bidden to regard, as the comparison of the spider is not the most suitable one that could have been chosen for a ravisher, though Mr. Blackie appears to think otherwise. This may reconcile us to Eustathius as a voucher for *ἄρος* in the sense of *ὄφελος*, unless it should be thought that *ἄρκος*, which has the authority of Alcæus, is more probable. Further we cannot pretend to go. As to the antistrophe, we have merely to remind Mr. Paley that *ἔχιδνα δ' ὥς μέ τις* (?) seems purposely meant to balance *ἄραχνος ὥς βάδην*, and also that he cannot be said to have restored the metre, when he has given no better equivalent for *ὄναρ ὄναρ μέλαν* than *πόδ' ἐνδακούσ' ἄγει* (qu. *ἔχει*).

V. 895. We have little doubt about accepting Porson's *ἄγω*, with a note of interrogation after *πῶς δ' οὐχί*; but see no reason

for altering *τὰπολωλόθ'*. 'That which was lost' here, as in the passage in S. Luke, sufficiently implies a relation to the person seeking or finding.

V. 896. It may be a question whether we should not read *ποίοις ἀνειπῶν* here, and *θεοῖς ἀνειπῶν*, v. 898, *ἀνειπεῖν* being a word especially used of heralds. *Θεοὺς ἀνειπῶν* has also been conjectured by Burges.

V. 897. See on v. 153.

V. 901. Though we do not approve of Mr. Paley's ellipse, which makes this line the completion of v. 895, we agree with him that the context fixes the sense of *ἀγοιμ' ἄν* as against Wellauer.

Vv. 905, 906. Mr. Paley's silence, we conclude, is meant to show that he adheres to the view of his former edition, understanding *ἀβουκόλητον*, κ.τ.λ. 'that is not a thing I heed.' In that case we do not see how he could avoid reading with Heath *λέγοιμ' ἄν*. Wellauer, in defending the one, points out the only possible way of regarding the other: 'Præco, se cum rege loqui ignorans, jubet eum ipsum hæc convicia ad Ægyptios perferre: deinde quum rex hoc personæ suæ convenire negasset, quærit præco, quis sit.' *Ἀβουκόλητον* then would mean 'I have other cattle to look after,' and *φρόνημα* would bear the sense which it does in Prom. 953.

V. 907. The later Editors have plainly been right in restoring *εἰδῶς* here and *τοῦνομ' ἐν χρόνῳ*, v. 915. There can be little question, too, about the truth of Bothe's or Burges' *εἴσει σύ τ' αὐτός*.

V. 927. Mr. Paley's *τόδ' ἐστὶν ἤδη* is surely very improbable. To those who are not satisfied with the choice of readings already before them, we beg to offer a new one, *ἔστω* (or *ἔσται*) *τάδ' ἢ δέι' πόλεμον αἰρήσει νέον*.

V. 936. 'Εὐθυμῆν ἐστὶν libri, et mox ἐντυχούση. Depravatus videtur versus extra spem emendandi.' (Paley.) We read *εἰ θυμός ἐστιν*, 'if you have a mind,' either connecting the clause with the two lines preceding, or, if the full stop at the end of v. 935 be retained, supposing the usual ellipse of *καλῶς ἔχει*. (In this conjecture we find from Wellauer that we have been anticipated by Bothe, who, as usual, silently withdraws it in his second edition). For the rest, we decidedly prefer Porson's *εὐτίκους*, as Mr. Paley once did.

V. 939. We cannot encourage Mr. Paley's hope (as originally expressed) that he has been the first to point this passage rightly. On the contrary, it seems to us clear that *τὰ λῶστα* and *τὰ θυμηδέστατα* go together, so that *πάρεστι* must be taken, as it well may be, parenthetically.

Vv. 952—956. More than one of the editors have noted it as strange that the king should address the servants. We wonder

that no one has seen that these lines belong to the Chorus, from whom alone the words φίλαι δμωίδες would naturally come. Having spoken of the dangers of evil report (v. 949), they proceed to caution their attendants.

V. 961. 'Πικρῶς recte vertit Scholef. *cum indignatione*;' (Paley.) In that case we should rather have expected τὰ πραχθέντα πρὸς τῶν ἔκτενῶν φίλων, κ. τ. λ., as it would not be the precautions but the sufferings of Danaus that would excite indignation. The phrase it is true is used generally, but always, so far as we see, with some reference to action. We are not sure, however, whether it would be worth while on this account to connect πικρῶς with τοὺς ἔκτενεις φίλους, so as to produce the same antithesis as in Cho. 234. τοὺς φιλτάτους γὰρ οἶδα νῶν ὄντας πικρούς. Some perhaps may be tempted to proceed further, and substitute πικροὺς for πικρῶς here.

V. 966. Mr. Paley is quite right in complaining of the impracticability of this and the following line, to which the later editors have not paid sufficient attention. The change which he proposes, τυγχάνοντα πρευμενῇ for τυγχάνοντας εὐπρυμνῇ, and χρέων for ἐμοῦ, would be satisfactory enough, if it were not so violent. We should prefer to read τυγχάνοντας, ἐν πρύμνῃ . . . νόμος. With regard to ἐν πρύμνῃ, we find we have been anticipated by Mr. Paley himself in his first edition, though he does not appear to appreciate the force which we would give to the word, 'in the bottom' (or in the language of the Psalms, 'ground') 'of the heart'; πρύμνη = πρέμνη, as πρύμνοθεν appears = πρέμνοθεν. With τυγχάνοντας—σέβεσθαι νόμος compare Cho. 150. ὑμᾶς δὲ κωκυτοῖς ἐπανθίζειν νόμος. Or, if we adopt σέβεσθε, a reading which, considering the variations of the MSS. in other places, is quite as probable, we might obtain the same result by reading νόμῳ or νέμειν, understanding σέβεσθε νέμειν not like σέβομαι προσιδέσθαι in Pers. v. 694, but in the sense which the verb bears with a common accusative. In that case, however, it will of course be necessary to read τυγχάνοντος with Stanley.

V. 976. Mr. Paley does not mention Linwood's (or rather Bothe's) τί μὴν; the truth of which, we think, cannot be gained, as it is really only a restoration of the reading of the Med. MS. Adopting it, we shall have to look for an accusative for κηραίνουσι; and this, as it seems to us, may be gained without difficulty by removing the full stop at the end of v. 977, and reading, in v. 978, καρπώματα στάζονθ', ἃ κηρύσσει Κῆρυς. If we are right thus far, we may conjecture further that κωλυνουσαν, in v. 979, has been substituted for some verb which was coupled with κηραίνουσι, describing the ravages committed on the unripe fruit, and so that κάλωρα should be changed, as

Stanley changed it, into *κᾶωρα*. But the whole line is hopeless in the last degree, so as to leave no room for isolated guesses. We are sorry to add that we do not see the slightest probability in Mr. Paley's emendation, in spite of the confidence which has led him, after the lapse of seven years, to retain it in the text.

V. 998. From Dindorf's account it appears that the reading of the Aldine Ed. is not as Wellauer supposed, *οἷς χάμ'*, but *οἰχάμ'*, and that it cannot be adduced in favour of the change of *οἰ* into *οἷς*. That change, however, is so slight that it may stand on its own merits, especially when taken in connexion with *περιναίεται*, the most natural and obvious correction of the corrupt *περιναίετε*, unless we prefer *περιναίεται*, *sensu neutro*, which might be better, as *περιναίειν* does not seem to occur elsewhere. This seems to us better than adopting, as Mr. Paley now does, the doubtful middle form, *περιναίονται*, from Hermann, for the sake of producing exact conformity with so unusual a variety of the genus Ionic a Minore as v. 1009.

V. 1008. *πολύτεκνοι* seems used as an epithet of *ποταμοί*, like *ἄτεκνος* of *λιχίν*. Eum. 785. Otherwise we might read *πολυτέκνου*.

V. 1025. We prefer *ψεδυροί* to *ψίθυροι*, both as the less common word, and as seemingly better supported by the MSS. The two forms seem to bear the same relation to each other as *ψυθής* and *ψευδής*.

V. 1026. Haupt's *ἐπιπλοίας* we think, with Mr. Paley, the best correction proposed for *ἐπιπνοιαί*. *Τί ποτ'*, just below, seems genuine. The sense is, as we take it, not 'Why have they had fair gales if not to capture me?' but 'Why should fair gales wait on pursuers?' a reproach which the semichorus meets by counselling resignation. This will agree well enough with the common view, which makes the nominative to *ἔπραξαν* the enemy; and *διωγμοῖς* the dativus instrumenti: but it will be more clearly brought out if we understand *ἔπραξαν* of the gods granting a favourable voyage, and *διωγμοῖς* as a dativus commodi. Cf. Ag. 150. *ἀπλοίας τεύξη*.

V. 1035. We cannot accept Mr. Paley's explanation of this very difficult passage, *οὗτος ὁ γάμος ἀποβαίη ὡς πολλοὶ γάμοι ἀπέβησαν προτέραις γυναιξί*. The use of *γάμων τελευτὰ* is surely fixed by Ag. 745, as well as by the common use of *τέλος*, to be the consummation of marriage, not an escape from it. *Μετὰ πολλῶν*, we suspect, ought to go with *γυναικῶν*, not with *γάμων*. The sense then will be, 'May wedlock come to many women before me.' Or we may take *πέλοι* as equivalent to *πέλοι ἂν*, and understand the words as a reassurance, 'Fate must have its way—but marriage may be destined for many sooner than for us.' We do not see why *προτερᾶν* should not stand in

this sense, though *προτέρα* or *πρότερον* would be more natural. Again, we might read *πέλει* with Bothe, so as to get a third interpretation, 'it is no more than many women have done before.' The 'Hμ. β'. we may remark, is rather disposed to discourage than to assent to extravagant petitions. In any case we would restore the Doric *πολλᾶν* for *πολλῶν*. As Mr. Paley remarks on *προτερᾶν*, 'raro in libris vel vestigium Dorici genitivi hodie reperitur.'

Vv. 1037—1046. Dindorf seems right in dividing this passage into strophe and antistrophe instead of, with Mr. Paley, making it an epode. There is a natural division at the end of v. 1041, so that the only thing wanted is to apportion the whole fairly between 'Hμ. α'. and β'. His arrangement, however, is objectionable, as putting vv. 1044, 1045, into the mouth of the same speaker, whereas it is clear that *μέτριον νῦν ἔπος εὐχου* is answered by *τίνα καιρόν με διδάσκεις*; to which *τὰ θεῶν μηδὲν ἀγάζειν* is the final rejoinder. We should propose a somewhat different scheme, giving vv. 1037-9 to 'Hμ. α'. v. 1040 to 'Hμ. β'. v. 1041 to 'Hμ. α'. then in the antistrophe reversing the order, so that 'Hμ. β'. would have vv. 1042-4, 'Hμ. α'. 1045, and 'Hμ. β'. v. 1046. This would preserve the difference of tone apparently intended in the speeches of the two Choral divisions, the one passionate and querulous, the other resigned and hortatory—a distinction seemingly perceived by Dindorf, but totally overlooked by Mr. Paley, whose plan has the further disadvantage of making 'Hμ. α'. both the first and the last speaker, so that 'Hμ. β'. has to go on with vv. 1047-1052, and 'Hμ. α'. to finish the play. *Τὸ μὲν ἂν βέλτατον εἴη* would then be added as a kind of taunt, in answer to the counsels of resignation previously given in v. 1031, 'May Zeus deliver us from this marriage! That is the best and only thing for us.' In v. 1040 we agree with Mr. Paley in understanding *ἄθελκτον* not of Zeus, but of the subject of their prayer. Compare Cho. 420. *πᾶρεστι σάλειν, τὰ δ' (τὰ ἄχρα) οὔτι θέλγεται*. *Μέλλω*, in v. 1042, seems to have a reference to *τὸ μέλλον* in v. 1041, 'My future is not to pry into Zeus' unfathomable purposes.' *Ἀγάζειν*, in v. 1046, is well explained by Mr. Paley in a note, to which our Oxford lexicographers would do well to refer.

V. 1052. *εὐμενεῖ βία κτίσας* seems to admit of no plausible explanation as it stands. The words themselves are good and Æschylean, but yield no sense in the present connexion, as *κτίζω* appears hardly to be used with a single accusative of the person, unaccompanied by anything to express the action of the verb, except in the sense of *producing* or *begetting*, as in v. 171 above. If we could supply a word, such as *ἐμφρονα* or *ἐγκυον*, either of which would express the influence of Zeus on Io, all would be

right, but there is nothing in the context to help us to it, either directly or indirectly, by suggesting a possible corruption: so we must suppose either that *κτίσας* may have a peculiar sense of which we know nothing, or that the reading of the line is wrong. *Εὐμενῇ βίον κτίσας* would not be a violent alteration, and might be defended in point of expression from Cho. 350. *ἐπιστρεπτὸν αἰῶ κτίσας*, but we do not like to part with *βία*, though involving a different view of Zeus' operations from that given in our remarks on v. 570.

V. 1053. We see nothing better for *τὸ βέλτερον κακοῦ καὶ τὸ δῖμοιρον αἰνῶ* than Mr. Paley's explanation, 'I submit to a chequered lot.' For *ἔπεισθαι* we would propose *ἐπέσται*, keeping *δίκαι δίκας*, the latter as the gen. singular. 'Justice shall preside over our cause,' or, perhaps, 'our cause shall stand on justice.'

We had hoped to say something more general about the play: but our limits warn us that we must conclude. What our readers will think of the extent to which we have entered into critical detail we know not: we only hope that some will be found to agree with us that it is worth while occasionally to examine with care and patience an edition of a classical work, especially one which, even after the second thoughts of one of the best scholars of the day, still leaves so much to be gleaned by a reviewer as the *Supplices* of Æschylus.

ART. VI.—*The Law relating to the Convocations of the Clergy: with Forms of Proceedings in the Provinces of Canterbury and York, &c.* By ROBERT R. PEARCE, ESQ. of Gray's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. London: S. Sweet. 1848.

NOTHING is further from our purpose than to enter into anything like a discussion of the momentous subject of the future Synodical action of the Church of England. It is a matter which will settle itself. It shapes itself as it grows. It is assuming an orderly and formal guise the more surely, because the more indirectly. All that we are at present concerned with is the immediate step. It is best to confine ourselves to the next and indispensable move. We are not called upon to forecast, or to be prepared with, a great and perfect future for the Church's legislation. Constitutions are capable of paper symmetry and completeness: but somehow one of these literary forms of government never advances beyond its literary perfection. We want no ecclesiastical Siéyes nor Bentham: when Convocation gets to work it will reform itself without doubt. Let the first step be to get it into action. For ourselves, we may own, are no great admirers of its present constitution. There are traces in it, unquestionably, of large, important principles; but there are also evident signs of those principles being overlaid and deteriorated. In some particulars they are inapplicable to the present state of the Church: in others, to an advanced stage of intellectual culture. Convocation being no longer an assembly, one of whose chief functions, if not its chief function, was to tax the Clergy, there seems no reason for restricting the ecclesiastical franchise to the beneficed Clergy. Again, since much of its future business must be concerned with doctrine, some provision ought to be made for the theological faculty of the Universities being represented in it. Since, moreover, the Capitular Clergy are not at present in that supreme advance, moral or intellectual, of the parochial Clergy which they once laid claim to, the disproportion between the proctors for the Cathedral Chapters and the parochial proctors might reasonably be abolished. Neither have we any very decided feelings as to the desirableness of retaining two provincial Synods. Again: the various and discordant customs which prevail in the different dioceses, and under which the parochial proctors are elected, might well be simplified and reduced to uniformity. We specify these matters, not because any of them at present are of paramount importance, but merely to show that our unceremonious dismissal of such subjects on the present occa-

sion is not to be attributed to any lack of interest in the future constitution of Convocation. Nay, the very interest of such questions may, at this juncture, draw men's minds from that which is their first concern. We have a pressing and engaging work : let all be kept subordinate to it. Before our next number reaches our readers, the Proctors in the new Convocation may have been elected. At present let us pay some attention to the elections.

A new Convocation is, at the present moment, a very important matter. No one knows what may come of it. The stirring of the dry bones of the past, which has already taken place, cannot come to nothing. We by no means say that the future of the Church of England depends on the next Convocation. Very far from it : but it is not so improbable that some matter may come before it in which it is desirable that the Church should be fairly represented. Naturally and in the order of events, the next stage in the agitation and movement for recovering Synodical action is the next election of Proctors. To this it is well that the immediate efforts of Churchmen should be concentrated. To get the right candidates—Proctors who will attend at every prorogation, will watch every opening for business, who will work in the temper of those who built the wall of Jerusalem, will spare neither expense nor trouble in the cause—is not easy, but most necessary. When the last Proctors were appointed—or appointed themselves—in the old lazy humdrum way, who could have foreseen what was reserved for them? If the next Parliament, or next Convocation, should survive its normal period of five or six years, can it be reasonably predicted that nothing will depend on the parochial Proctors? They exist, to be sure, but as a small numerical component of even the Lower House : but their position, the interests which they represent, and their cohesion, make them the most important section in it. If the elective Proctors do their duty, they will always be enabled at the very least to prevent mischief in Convocation. Were our advice asked, we should urge considerable care in the selection of candidates. Church Unions might profitably take up the details of the next election. Much carelessness, perhaps positive irregularity with respect to the citations to the incumbents to elect, may be prevented. The local customs may be profitably watched. Search into the Diocesan Registers with respect to the existence of customs might be prosecuted, as, for instance, whether Archdeaconries elect conjointly or separately, and, if any, in whom and by what prescription exists the power of reducing the Proctors elected by the several Archdeaconries to two, to represent the whole Diocese. This point we think important, for it is by no means improbable, that, as in our parliamentary history there was a time in which it was considered a burthen to represent a county

or borough, so this reduction of the parochial Proctors might have been originally intended as a relief. Now, however, that a seat in Convocation, like a seat in the House of Commons, has its value, it would be very important to ascertain how the election by an Archdeaconry of 'two sufficient Procurators' is, without process, set aside. In a word, we think that those interested in the revival of Synodical action, whether by Convocation or by Synods, diocesan or provincial, would do well to turn their thoughts, perhaps exclusively, to the next election of Proctors. The duty which is nearest is dearest.

In a question growing on the mind of the Church, as that of Synodical action is, it is, to say the least, not likely that the next meeting of Convocation will be less important or interesting than the last. And very important that meeting was. It was the first occasion since the collapse of Convocation in Hoadley's case that business has been actually transacted. Gradually the Proctors have been occupying this point: session by session they have crept on: post by post has been won from official irresolution and apathy. The 'cold obstruction' of the Upper House has at length been kindled: perplexed and baffled, beaten back from subterfuge to subterfuge, even Sir John Dodson was at length carried away. Silenced but not convinced, the Queen's Advocate was compelled to remain a reluctant witness of the ecclesiastical fact of the year, the event which will give the expiring Convocation a name in History, an actual Debate in Convocation. We have been at some pains to acquire an exact account of what occurred at the last Session of Convocation. Its contingent, as well as actual, importance, requires that it should receive at least as permanent a record as our own pages can give: and the readers of the *Christian Remembrancer* may depend on its authenticity.

No notice had been given of the intention of the Archbishop of Canterbury to hold a meeting of Convocation on the 3d February. But as much interest was felt among the Clergy, in consequence of what had passed last year, when a petition was received by his Grace and the Upper House, inquiry was made as to the day and time, and Wednesday, the 3d February, at twelve o'clock, having been found to be the time appointed;—

The Bishops of London, Winchester, Exeter, Chichester, Oxford, Lichfield, S. Asaph attended at twelve o'clock. The Archbishop had appointed a Meeting of all the Bishops at the Bounty Board at half-past twelve o'clock, in order to consider the provisions of a new Clergy Offences Bill—and the suggestions of certain Clergymen respecting the separation of the Offices in Divine Service.

Petitions were presented¹ from nineteen of the twenty-one Dioceses of

¹ In the Upper House the Bishop of London presented petitions from the Dioceses of London, Winchester, Ely, Gloucester and Bristol, and Worcester, praying the Convocation to take such steps as should appear to them most effectual to procure from the Crown the necessary licence for the performance

the Province of Canterbury, praying the House to address a Petition to her Majesty to sanction the meeting of Convocation for real synodal action. It could not be said that the matter came by surprise on the Archbishop; for a Petition had been entrusted to his Grace to present to the House—which Petition he had requested some other Bishop to present.

In presenting the Petitions entrusted to himself, the Bishop of Oxford declared his intention of moving that the House consider the prayer of the Petitions. Upon this, the Queen's Advocate (Sir J. Dodson) interposed, saying, that he felt it his duty, as legal adviser of the Archbishop, to declare that such a proceeding was without precedent; that for 135 years the Crown had called Convocation to meet merely as a form, and had not permitted it to perform any business, citing the statute of 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, as forbidding Convocation to do any business whatsoever, without the express permission of the Crown.

Upon this, the Bishop of Exeter said, that, though he had not lately looked into that statute, yet his recollection of its import was clear, that the learned Queen's Advocate had ascribed to it inadvertently much larger words than it really contained. He had cited the word *business*, as used by the statute; whereas his (the Bishop's) recollection was clear, (speaking with due deference in contradiction to so high a legal authority,) that the prohibition in the 25 Hen. VIII. was not against Convocation doing any business whatever without the Royal Licence, but against making Canons, or conferring together for the making of Canons, when assembled under such Licence. [The Queen's Advocate assented.] The Bishop recognised the right of the Archbishop to prorogue the Convocation at pleasure—to stop him, if he thought fit, while he was speaking. But as to the fitness of his Grace's being advised to do so, on the ground of no precedent having occurred of Convocations doing more than meeting and bowing, and being dismissed, during nearly a century and a half, he must be permitted to express his astonishment at such a reason being given for such advice. Why, the disuse of all action on the part of Convocation, for so long a period, was the very matter of complaint—the grievance which was to be remedied: to make the existence of that very grievance to be a reason for its continuance, was nothing short of mockery. In conclusion, he said, that he must be a bold man, who would advise the Archbishop (contrary to his Grace's own nature and disposition) to reject on such a ground the prayer of the Clergy of almost every Diocese in the Province. If precedent

of their constitutional functions. The Bishop of Exeter presented similar petitions from the Dioceses of Exeter, Hereford, Bangor, Llandaff, and Peterborough. The Bishop of Chichester presented petitions to the same effect from the Dioceses of Chichester, Bath and Wells, Lincoln, and Rochester; a petition in which a wish was expressed for the admission of delegates from the communicant laity to the synodical assemblies of the Church; and a petition from the London Union on Church Matters, praying Convocation to address the Crown for licence to make Canons for the more effectual representation of the Church of England in Convocation or Synod; and until such licence be granted, to make public declaration of their want of confidence in any measures affecting the spiritualities of the Church, which may be prepared in Parliament without the previous counsel and concurrence of a Synodical assembly of the Church, and in particular in the proposed additional measure for the enforcement of discipline among the Clergy. The Bishop of Lichfield presented a petition from his own Diocese, praying the Convocation to address the Crown for licence to perform its constitutional functions. The Bishop of Oxford presented similar petitions from the Dioceses of Oxford, Norwich, Salisbury, and S. David's. The Bishop of S. Asaph presented a petition from his own Diocese. A petition from the Diocese of Canterbury was likewise presented at his Grace's request.

was to be cited, let them look to the precedent set by that Sovereign who died a martyr to his fidelity to the Church. His declaration, prefixed to the Articles, and reprinted as often as the Book of Common Prayer was printed, contained a solemn promise that the Sovereign would do, as often as Convocation should ask him to do, that which it was the prayer of all these Petitions that we should beseech her Majesty to do.

The Bishop of Oxford said, that the motion which he intended to make was not of the general nature which might be expected. There was notice of the intention to introduce a new Clergy Discipline Bill—a matter in which the Clergy at large were immediately interested, and on which they (the Bishops) all knew, that the greatest dissatisfaction was felt and expressed by the Clergy, that they were not consulted. He, therefore, deemed it his duty to move, that this House do present an humble Address to her Majesty, praying her Majesty to issue her Royal Licence for Convocation to meet and consult together respecting the fittest provisions to be introduced into the intended Bill.

The Bishops of London, Exeter, and Chichester expressed their warm assent to this motion; after which the Bishops of Winchester, Lichfield, and S. Asaph declared themselves against it. The Bishop of S. Asaph stated, seemingly as his main reason, that the Bishops present were but a small portion of the Episcopate of the Province—that their absent brethren ought to have an opportunity of expressing their judgment on the matter—that their absence could be well accounted for by the ordinary practice of the House meeting for no other purpose than to be prorogued—and, therefore, that no decision ought to be had, without due notice being given to all, in order that all might be enabled to form and declare a judgment on so grave a question.

The fairness of this suggestion was acknowledged by all; and the Bishop of Oxford, with the full concurrence of those Bishops who had supported his motion, pressed on his Grace the fitness of proroguing, for a definite, and not very remote period. He submitted that a month would be a sufficient time, for all to be informed, and to be prepared.

His Grace, declaring that he thought it most unfit that the Church should be placed in opposition to her Majesty's Government, announced his purpose to prorogue to the 19th of August next. Upon this, the Bishop of Oxford gave notice that on that day he should repeat the motion which he had this day made.

The Lower House was then sent for, in order to the prorogation. On their arrival, the Prolocutor, holding a paper in his hand, stated that he had to present an Address to the Upper House, which, with his Grace's permission, he would read. His Grace said, that they had been sent for, in order that the Convocation be prorogued. Sir John Dodson, the Queen's Advocate, declared that it was contrary to all precedent, that, under such circumstances, an Address from the Lower House should be received. The Bishop of Exeter saying, that he much doubted the accuracy of this statement, or at least its relevancy, the Lower House was desired to retire to their chamber, while this question was considered. After they had retired, the Bishop of Exeter, still doubting the accuracy of the Queen's Advocate's statement, said, that whether it was accurate, or not, he ventured to submit to his Grace's consideration, whether he would reject the Address of the other House by the exercise of a power, which did indeed undoubtedly belong to his high office.

His Grace declared his willingness to receive the Address. Accordingly the Lower House was recalled; their Address was read, received, and entered as part of the proceedings of the day. After which, his Grace declared the prorogation to the 19th of August next.

In the Lower House (present—the Dean of Canterbury, Prolocutor; the Archdeacons of Maidstone, Bath, Barnstaple, Bristol, Sarum, Taunton; and of the Proctors, the Rev. Drs. Mill, Spry, Coleridge, and Moore; the Rev. Messrs. Huntley, Mills, Lowther, Randolph, Woodgate, Gillett, Majendie, Yardley, Harding, and Goddard,) several petitions of a nature similar to those presented in the Upper House were presented.

A long and important Address to the Upper House of Convocation, setting forth many of the difficulties under which the Church labours, and praying that the two Houses might at once proceed to business, and especially urging the gravity of the occasion, and the mockery and unreality which the Convocation sanctioned by its practice of formal meeting for the mere purpose of adjournment, after the solemn prayers¹ which had been recited, was moved by Mr. Huntley and seconded by Dr. Mill. After considerable discussion on the various topics embraced in this Address, it was suggested by the Archdeacon of Maidstone, that as the House may be summoned for prorogation before so extensive an Address could be satisfactorily settled, it would be better to adopt a shorter Address; the Archdeacons of Barnstaple and Taunton strongly urging the insertion of that part of Mr. Huntley's address which related to the inconsistency between the solemn prayers offered, and a mere formal sitting. It was then urged that Mr. Huntley's Address should be referred to a Committee, consisting of Mr. Huntley, Dr. Spry, Mr. Randolph, and the Archdeacon of Maidstone, who should report upon it at the next meeting of the Convocation. Meanwhile the Archdeacon of Maidstone proposed a short form of address, which was seconded by Mr. Majendie, and, with an addition suggested by the Archdeacon of Bristol, adopted, to the following effect:—

'That this Lower House of Convocation has this day received numerous Petitions from many dioceses, praying for proper steps being taken to secure the revival of the synodical action of the Church; that this House sympathises with the prayer of these Petitions, and having especial reference to the solemn character of the prayers offered at the commencement of the session of Convocation, which character appears to be altogether inconsistent with the system of continual prorogation, begs to call the attention of the Upper House to the reasonableness of the prayer of the Petitions.'

The Prolocutor having taken charge of the Address, and being about to proceed with it to the Upper House, the Apparitor at the same moment appeared to summon the Lower House for the act of prorogation.

During the Debate in the Upper House on the propriety of receiving

¹ These prayers are the ordinary Litany, with the addition of the suffrage:—

'Ut præsentì huic Convocationi Spiritu Tuo Sancto aspirare et præesse digneris, qui nos ducat in omnem veritatem, quæ est secundum pietatem; Te rogamus, audi nos, Domine.'

And of the prayer:—

'Domine Deus Pater Luminum et Fons omnis Sapientiæ; Nos ad scabellum pedum Tuorum provoluti, humiles tui et indigni famuli, Te rogamus, ut qui in nomine Tuo, sub auspiciis clementissimæ Reginæ Victoriæ hic convenimus, Gratiâ Tuâ cœlitus adjuti, ea omnia investigare, meditari, tractare, et discernere valeamus, quæ honorem Tuum et gloriam promoveant et in Ecclesiæ cedant profectum. Concede igitur ut Spiritus Tuus, qui Concilio olim Apostolico, huic nostro etiam nunc insideat, ducatque nos in omnem veritatem, quæ est secundum pietatem; Ut qui ad amussim Sanctæ Reformationis nostræ, errores, corruptelas et superstitiones olim hic grassantes, Tyrannidemque Papalem, merito et serio repudiavimus, Fidem Apostolicam et vere Catholicam firmiter et constanter teneamus omnes, Tibique rite puro cultu intrepidi serviamus, per Jesum Christum Dominum et Servatorem nostrum.—Amen.'

the Address, the Committee for considering Mr. Huntley's Address was appointed, and ordered to report at the next meeting of Convocation. The proceedings occupied two hours.

Such was the last meeting of Convocation, of which the immediate result was the courteous conduct of the Bishop of London, who at once signified his purpose to abandon the Clergy Discipline Bill, against which the Clergy had in their petitions so strongly protested, until in some way the opinion of the Church could be formally taken upon it. Not only, then, has Convocation, for the first time for a hundred and thirty years, met—not only has it received petitions—not only has it debated—not only have the two Houses met in conference, but the principle is established that no measure deeply affecting the interests and sympathies of the Church will henceforth be submitted to Parliament without the formal intervention and consultation of some deliberative ecclesiastical body. The Bishops—ably and worthily so represented—have, in the person of the Bishop of London, declined for the future the onerous and ungenial work of legislating for all orders of the Church. This is the first success of the attempt to revive Convocation. A session so important as that which we have reported is not likely to be succeeded by a less interesting one. Are we then premature in urging attention to the composition of the next Convocation, which certainly must meet, *and must agree upon an Address to the Crown*, in the summer or autumn of the present year?

NOTICES.

UPON Sir George Stephen's 'Review of Mr. Barber's Case,' (Walford,)—and we own it to be a one-sided one—our sympathies are enlisted with Mr. Barber. The case—merely as one of the most remarkable of the *causes célèbres* of our own time—is especially interesting and dramatic; and while we frankly own that to pronounce a decided opinion on Mr. Barber's complicity requires a very technical and legal estimate of evidence, to which such as ourselves can lay no claim, still there are certain broad facts in this case which are open to the judgment of ordinary minds, and are of serious importance. Such as these: Mr. Barber is found guilty of a certain crime; sentenced, and transported for life accordingly. Subsequent facts come out; the case is further investigated; it seems very doubtful whether Mr. Barber is guilty; a conditional pardon is granted; the case is further sifted; and for some reason or other, as a fact, a full and free pardon is granted. Now this is one of those beautiful pieces of folly called a legal fiction. The law cannot acknowledge that it has done wrong; it cannot set aside its own hasty judgment; it cannot annihilate its proceedings. The verdict is still the verdict; the judgment, the judgment; the felon, the felon. So to get matters straight, the felon, who is *ex terminis* no longer a felon, is pardoned for the crime which he has never committed. A pardon, if words have meaning, still assumes and implies the fact and existence of the crime, which, while it condones, it asseverates. But the case in question is one which, from its enunciation, is that of a man who has not committed at least the crime for which he was sentenced. Again, Sir George Stephen brings out as a fact, what, for the honour of human nature, we trust is untrue: Mr. Barber had been removed from Norfolk Island to Impression Bay; his pardon arrives, the prosecution having already utterly ruined him; when put on board the convict ship 'he was entirely destitute of clothing; hence, when on receiving his pardon he was ordered to divest himself of his prison dress, he remonstrated on the ground that he had no other . . . the superintendent compelled him to strip, as the best preparation for a walk of ninety miles to Hobart Town through the jungle . . . and it was only by the charity of the convicts themselves, who supplied him, one with a coat, another with trowsers, that he was not discharged in utter nudity, a passage by sea, even, being denied him,' (pp. 85, 86.) This exceeds all belief: a man who, whether innocent or not, is released from the penalty attaching to a charge which is now relinquished, is transported 20,000 miles, ruined, and left without a rag of his own; it is discovered that he ought not to have been transported, and then, by the tender mercies of our Christian authorities, who have done wrong, he is turned upon the world stark naked to find his way without a shirt or a sixpence ninety miles through the Australian bush. There must be mistake or exaggeration in this.

A really good abridgment of an expensive standard work cannot fail to be a benefit to the public. Mr. Clinton's 'Fasti Hellenici' has been too

long before the world to need any praise of ours: but its size and price have hitherto rendered it inaccessible to the great mass of ordinary classical students. This evil is now remedied by the author himself, in an 'Epitome of the Civil and Literary Chronology of Greece, from the Earliest Accounts to the Death of Augustus.' (Oxford: University Press.) The substance of those quartos is presented in a single compact octavo. 'In the present volume,' Mr. Clinton says, 'the quotations and references are omitted, the principal facts and observations are retained, and sometimes the arguments by which the facts are established.' There is also some additional matter, founded on evidence which has been collected since the last edition of the 'Fasti' was published. Not the least interesting feature in the book is a reply to Mr. Grote's chapter on the application of Chronology to Grecian Legend, going over nearly the same ground as Colonel Mure in his recent pamphlet. Without pretending to enter deeply into the controversy, we confess that our sympathy with Mr. Grote's view remains substantially unimpaired. Whether from indolence or from any better reason, we naturally listen to an author who tells us that all attempts to extract pure history from pure legend are a mere *labor ineptiarum*. Mr. Clinton warns us against thinking that the fables engrafted by the Epic poets on the tale of Troy cast a doubt on the reality of the event itself, and appeals to the Crusades as a parallel case. But we believe in the Crusades on the strength, not of contemporary fiction, but of contemporary history—rather an important difference. Nor does it seem to us conclusive to say that the Homeric poems, to be 'plausible fiction,' must have had a basis of truth. The argument merely proves that Homer did not invent the whole of his plot and characters, which Mr. Grote, we suppose, would grant, asserting that he took the substance of the legend as he found it. But whether Mr. Clinton be right or wrong in his view of the Heroic age of Greece, the usefulness of his book will be impeached by no one—least of all by Undergraduates reading for the Schools.

'The Vegetation of Europe,' by Mr. A. Henfrey, (Van Voorst,) is the first of a series of hand-books on the natural history of the European continent. It is a succinct but able and full account of the climatic distribution of plants. The general features of the physical geography are firmly and decisively touched: the mutual influences of geology and temperature, as dependent upon marine currents and the structural conformation of land, are elegantly shown; and we do not know where, in so small a compass, to find the results of the great generalization conducted by Humboldt and the scientific physicists of the age. The botany of a country is the most unerring key to its various physical characteristics. An ingenious and, for its size, a full isothermal map is prefixed.

Dr. Alison, the historian of Europe, has, in a new and enlarged 'Life of Marlborough,' (Blackwood,) collected all that is important in the great captain's perplexed and varied career. In the concluding chapter, where a parallel is drawn between him and the other military notables of modern times, the author rises above himself—his style, often languid, becomes pointed, and he evidently kindles with his theme. The care and elaboration displayed in the arrangement of materials is the same of which Dr. Alison

is so great a master: the politics—and, may we say, prejudice?—and the redeeming heartiness and good purpose, are the same as in the History of Europe.

An important little volume on 'Irish Ethnology,' by Mr. G. Ellis, (Hodges and Smith,) establishes a fact which politicians are reluctant to face. We feel that statesmen who will not grasp the great facts of national character, and of the tendencies and characteristics of race, labour very much in the dark. It was one of the faults of the Irish Union, that its purpose, in itself unexceptionable, of forming one national organization, had not sufficient plasticity to adapt itself to the strong marks which separate, and seem likely to separate, Celt and Saxon, in religion, industry, manners, and politics.

'A Manual of Hebrew Antiquities,' (Rivingtons,) appears to be close and systematic. It is one of a series, produced under the able superintendence of Mr. Kerchever Arnold. Mr. Browne, of Chichester, is the Editor, and has judiciously woven up much of the German information on the subject.

Mr. Watkins, of Brixworth, has resuscitated an old collection of verses, which he published some twenty years ago, on the 'Human Hand,' &c. (Pickering.) He has added some new pieces, chiefly celebrating the illustrious squirearchy of Northamptonshire, who, in considerable numbers, have come forward with their applause and shillings. We could willingly have let these effusions die. In case our Protectionist readers are curious to know how their leaders will live in immortal song, they may like to see Mr. Watkins' anticipation of the poetical as well as political fame which awaits them. In an 'Elegy on the sudden Death of Lord George Bentinck,' Mr. Watkins takes courage:—

'But let not gloom and sorrow long prevail—
With short and manly grief we best bewail.
Thine and our own great Leader, Stanley, lives;
Thy meet yoke-fellow, too, Disraeli, gives
His splendid eloquence to aid the cause
Of hearth and home, of liberty and laws;
And Rutland's sons, of true patrician race:—
And Richmond, staunch and firm in every place,' &c.—P. 105.

'Mount Athos, Thessaly, and Epirus.' (Rivingtons.) The author, Mr. Bowen, Fellow of Brasenose, from his late official connexion with Corfu, and his intimate knowledge of the Romaic, has had peculiar means for acquiring information, which is very pleasantly imparted in this agreeable volume. A continual reference to classical association, happy quotations and allusion, make us respect Mr. Bowen's genial scholarship as much as we admire him as a companion in a tour.

'The Psalter, or Seven Hours of Prayer, according to the Use of the Church of Sarum,' (Masters,) is a remarkably beautiful book in its typography. It is sumptuously decorated, and illustrated with praiseworthy skill and diligence, and few, except those conversant with the old Office-Books, can understand what amount of pains and research and difficulty an editor must encounter in this thorny field of investigation. As an

antiquarian work, and as an important contribution to liturgical studies, we hail the appearance of this or similar works. They are most valuable in the illustration of our own Prayer-Book; and even on higher than archaeological grounds we are bound to look with respect to the devotions of our fathers. We quite concur in the statement of the Editor—a most honourable and ingenuous person—that it is an acceptable present to Liturgists generally. But—and a very serious abatement of our cordial acceptance of the volume it is—the title-page and preface inform us that it is ‘for private and cœnobial use,’ of course among ourselves. This we can neither accept nor understand. The invitation and offence seem so entirely gratuitous. It is quite plain that there is a portion—and that no inconsiderable one—of the book which no member of the Church of England as now constituted can consistently use: the invocations to the saints, the doctrine of the merits and mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, for example. We do not say that the book ought to have been ‘adapted;’ but we do say distinctly that it ought not to have been recommended. The matter is to us totally inexplicable, because we have no reason to doubt the Editor’s entire loyalty to the Church of England. After saying this, it is perhaps superfluous to add that we should have been better pleased with an edition in the original Latin, with the present instructive mass of English illustration—at any rate, we should then have escaped the unsatisfactory version of the Psalms, which contrasts unfavourably, and even disloyally, with our noble Prayer-Book version. The version of the Hymns is occasionally very happy—occasionally rather the reverse—but, generally speaking, of a level character.

It is not without its significance that the next work on our list is the ‘Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, adapted for general use in other Protestant Churches.’ (Pickering.) Whether this is to be viewed as a specimen of downward tendencies among ourselves, or upward tendencies among those adherents of the Church of the Future who combine æsthetics with eclectics, painted glass, screens, and chants with a Socinian creed, and a very elaborate *Gesang-Buch* with a denial of the Catholic Faith, we hardly know. At any rate the present book—and many of the same sort have preceded it—shows what a vast amount of excision, alteration, and adaptation the Church of England requires to make it keep step with ‘other Protestant Churches.’ It *only* gets rid of the Creeds, and of the Ministry, and of the Sacraments; it only rejects Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, Absolution, the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Atonement, and of the grace given in the Sacraments. These at present, it is something to know, prevent our accordance—and the consideration is not without its force remembering certain recent rescripts from Lambeth—with ‘other Protestant Churches.’ It is needless to criticise a work of this purpose: but we cannot but notice one direct falsification. Pref. p. xii. ‘In the present Liturgy of 1662 the ‘term *‘Bishop* is introduced, when in the Liturgies of 1549 and 1552 *Minister* is ‘used in the Confirmation Service;’ which implies that in the first Reformed Books Confirmation—as in the present performance, and as in the kindred German practice—was administered by other than the Bishop. The fact being that certain suffrages and collects which are now assigned to the

Bishop were then to be ~~used by the Priest, the act of confirmation being, of course, in all revisions of the office restricted to the Bishop.~~

'Gentle Influence,' (Masters,) is an extremely well-coloured tale. The characters are not new: nor the situation. But still it answers all purposes of a School-Reward Book; and we can recommend both its intention and execution.

We have received and read with great satisfaction the Bishop of Tasmania's 'Charge.' (Hobart Town: Best.) Its great value consists in the earnest and faithful reference which it makes to the disorganised state of the Colonial Church, as to the mutual relations between the Bishop and Clergy—a condition painfully illustrated by the details given in the Appendix. Bishop Nixon dwells forcibly on the desirableness of admitting a lay element, not only into the synodical, but also into the practical action of the Church. But with the minutes of the Australasian Synod before us—with firmness such as that for the most part displayed by the Bishops—with their general doctrinal soundness—with their integrity of purpose, we cannot, amid much to mourn over and much which is perplexing, but augur well for the future. The conduct of too many of the Missionary and Colonial Clergy, supported mainly by English liberality, is, however, becoming such a scandal as will soon attract serious attention on the part of those personally interested in contributing to the necessities of the Colonial Church.

The Bishop of Guiana's 'Charge,' (Rivingtons,) has also been published. The confiscation of the Clergy Reserves in Canada—the tampering with the incomes of the Demerara Clergy by the local legislature—the reluctance of the Australian congregations to provide for their teachers,—these facts—and such or similar occur in every Bishop's Charge which reaches us from the Colonies—convince us that the only way to make the Colonists value their privileges and their own stake in the Church, is to throw it entirely on its own resources and responsibilities.

The question just alluded to is approaching us. When we speak of the Colonial Church being left to its own resources, we have in view the little interest, or even the direct hostility, manifested by the colonial laity towards the Church and its principles. Thoughtful persons conceive that this difficulty—and it is obvious that it exists among ourselves—could be best met by developing the lay element and influence in the Church. To systematize and direct anomalous interference, it is thought the best means is to recognise a just and orderly lay cooperation. Mr. Gladstone, in an important 'Letter to the Bishop of Aberdeen,' (Murray,) has recommended this course—not without a plain reference to any changes which the existing condition of the English Convocation may require. He grounds his suggestions, not only on the principle of the thing and abstract justice, but on its unequivocal success in the Anglo-American Church, where it was introduced under the least promising auspices. That some such corrective must be introduced into any representative system of the Church is probable. The influence of the Crown upon the Church is weakened; Parliament, as now constituted, is properly reluctant to interfere with the spiritual concerns or self-management of a religious organization quite extraneous to itself. Still, while the Church remains in any, however faint, sense established, the

introduction of the lay element into Church Synods would serve as a check and counterbalance upon that factious interference with Church matters, which, though ineffective and discouraged in the House of Commons, still must be expected on the part of the Halls and Horsmans of the day; while at the same time it would serve, in the eyes of the public and of Parliament itself, to attract confidence to the proceedings and self-development of the Church. In a word, Parliament and the Crown might, in the development of the functions of laymen in Synods, accept a graceful occasion for abandoning much of those existing but ineffectual powers over the Church which they at present nominally retain. As the case stands, while Convocation or Synods are only struggling into new, or renewed, life, there are abundant counterbalances in the existing influences of the State on the exclusively clerical constitution of Convocation. When Synods assemble, and when Convocation reforms itself, the influence of the laity, now too often in a vexatious, and sometimes in a hostile, spirit manifested in the House of Commons, would be transferred to a more legitimate sphere in the Synod itself.

Such, or some such, considerations are a sufficient answer to 'Cautus,' who has addressed a 'Letter to Bishop Skinner,' (Lendrum,) on Mr. Gladstone's proposition. We must remind objectors of this class, that in some form or other, just as real though more indirect, a lay influence has always been brought to bear upon the Church, either directly, as in primitive times, or indirectly in the form of imperial laws, parliaments, a strong Regale, or the like. Against the morality of the view expressed by Cautus, p. 11,—viz. that 'the laity of the middle ages were great overgrown children, whom it was necessary for the Clergy to humour while they ruled them,' and that this fact might justify the appearance of 'dummy' laymen in ancient Synods, while the well-educated and well-taught laity of our own times are not to be trusted—we protest.

'The Nestorians and their Rituals.' (Masters.) This is a very important work, giving the annals of an interesting mission sent some years ago to the Nestorians in the person of Mr. Badger, a clergyman eminently qualified for the work. This mission—unhappily, as we think, relinquished—was conducted in a Church spirit, and had it been allowed to work out its course, might have counteracted much of the evil which is going on in the East, by the proselyting and schismatical proceedings which are countenanced by the Anglican Bishop at Jerusalem. The mission to the Nestorians had no sectarian purpose; it was simply to show the Orientals that our communion was a Church holding the creeds and catholic essentials. This object it materially gained; and there is something pathetic in the appeals urged by the Nestorian Patriarch to our own Bishops on the abandonment of the mission, just when it began to bear fruit and to be understood. Mr. Badger, in his first volume, gives the historical details of the mission, together with occasional and interesting descriptions of the country, its inhabitants, manners, and antiquities. In this last particular he is sometimes brought into collision with Mr. Layard. The second volume is given to an important translation of the extant Nestorian Rituals. Mr. Badger minimizes the importance of the Nestorian heresy: a sufficient counterpoise in this respect, however, is afforded by his Editor, Mr. Neale.

A useful and scholarly edition of the 'Apology of Theophilus of Antioch,' has been published under the auspices of the Syndics of the Cambridge Press, by Mr. W. G. Humphry. (J. W. Parker.)

We have received some very painful documents from the United States. An attack is organizing by the three Low Church Bishops of Virginia, (Meade,) Ohio, (M'Irvine,) and Maine, (Burgess,) upon the Bishop of New Jersey, (Doane.) The facts are, we believe, these:—Bishop Doane is, as everybody knows, a person of singular zeal and warmth of character. A certain impetuosity and lack of calculation is inseparable from this cast of mind. None can have read one of Bishop Doane's publications without understanding something of the man. Here is an extract taken quite at random from one of his recent publications: he is addressing his pupils of Burlington College. 'Go forth as men . . . Not men of any party. 'Not men exclusively of any State. Men of the whole Republic. Men of the Constitution. Men of this Union, now and for ever, one and indivisible. 'No fierce fanaticism of private prejudice. No idle phantom of a "higher law, which, like the wildfire of the bog, is never found, and never felt." ' &c. Here is the man, impetuous, irregular, picturesque, vehement, active, overflowing, kindling, and kindled. He deals in wild striking thoughts; he has a reckless dashing energy of speech and action; his prose abounds in a construction unknown to grammarians, the Nominative Absolute. Such as is his style, such, we have no doubt, is Bishop Doane's character. His episcopal income is very small, but he has established two flourishing and admirable institutions for education in his diocese, S. Mary's Hall, and Burlington College. The Bishop, with much more zeal than prudence, did everything *en grand*: spent all his resources, and borrowed money imprudently—availed himself of the facilities of raising funds which the United States afford—a monetary crisis occurs—and the Bishop is ruined. He does what is right—gives up his property—hands over the Colleges to trustees—does what he can. The creditors are satisfied—the matter is brought in May 1849 before the Convention of the Diocese; not one single voice is raised against the Bishop. We remember distinctly how on that occasion the lamented and valued Dr. Ogilby 'denounced the iniquity of founding any charge against the Bishop's moral character,' in connexion with this matter. The fervour and sincerity with which the Convention exonerated the Bishop, is fresh in our recollection. Here matters rest, until four persons, in August 1851, revive the charge, and enlist the triumvirate of Puritan Bishops. They, in September 1851, get up a letter conjointly to Bishop Doane, threatening him in a spirit of the utmost meekness, with proceedings before the Episcopal College. This epistle is not sent to Bishop Doane till February 1852; in the meantime, Bishop M'Irvine, in November, has an interview with Bishop Doane, and gives not the slightest intimation of the letter already two months old, and the impending prosecution already agreed upon. The whole thing is miserably transparent. It is a plot to crush Church principles. It is a direct conspiracy on the part of pledged partisans, against one whose chief fault is an uncalculating and imprudent carelessness in money matters, for the good of the Church. As such, we agree with Bishop Doane, in denouncing the move of the three associated Bishops. As was to be expected, the aggrieved

party, *more suo*, has issued a most indignant 'Reply,' which is satisfactory enough—and 'Protest.' We extract Bishop Doane's fervid conclusion:—

'And these are the four persons, and such are the charges, upon whose authority three Bishops of the Church of God, without acquaintance with the men, or inquiry as to their allegations, have relied, as the ground of criminal proceedings against their peer. Fearful indeed the reckoning they will have to meet. For the inroad which has thus been made upon the sacred sorrows of a desolate hearth; for the interruption of the daily duties of an office, which adds to the care of a parish and the care of two institutions in which two hundred of the sons and daughters of the Church are nurtured; for the storm which now must burst upon the peace and quiet of the Church; for this aggression on the Diocese of New Jersey; for this invasion of the rights of its Convention; for this injustice, indignity, and cruelty towards its Bishop—for the whole amount, and all the shapes, and every incident and consequence of this enormous wrong, the undersigned holds, as responsible, the Bishops of Virginia, Maine, and Ohio; accuses them before Christendom, and summons them, in all solemnity, before the judgment-seat of God.'

Mr. Keith Johnstone, so well and favourably known by his noble 'Physical Atlas,' has published a small but condensed and popular form of it in his 'School Atlas of Physical Geography.' (Blackwood.) We know nothing better calculated to arrest the attention of the young than these pictorial essays, if we may so call them. Geography in words is a dry and uninteresting subject: but in such a work as this it is clothed with life and reality. The relative proportion of land to water—the set of tides—the periodical drift of winds—the phenomena of meteorology—the distribution of heat and cold—the climatic apportionment of animal and vegetable life—even the ethnographic, educational, and religious statistics of man—are, in a suggestive and practical way, brought before the actual, as well as the mind's, eye. A companion volume, 'The General School Atlas,' which is neat and cheap, appears from the same editor and publishers.

Mr. Skinner's 'Guide for Lent,' (Hayes,) is earnest, deep, and sound. Without superseding, it equals most manuals already in use.—From the same publisher we have received Mr. Liddell's Sermon 'On the Division of Services,' preached at S. Barnabas, Pimlico, which is remarkable for its graceful and warm tribute to the character and successes of Mr. Bennett.

Connected with this, we have to acknowledge Mr. Bennett's touching and convincing 'Pastoral Letter to the Parishioners of Frome.' (Masters.) Touching and convincing we believe we may well call that, before which opposition so unworthily raised and fomented has died away. It is some consolation that the disastrous proceedings connected with S. Barnabas have had this termination.

'The Church Past and Present,' (Masters,) is the title of Four Advent Lectures on Church History, by Mr. Woodford, of Bristol. They are a clever synopsis: occasionally eloquent, always sensible. For ourselves—but perhaps it is a prejudice—we have the greatest dislike to the use by a preacher of the first person plural.

'Sayings and Doings of the Lord Bishop of Manchester,' (Masters,) by Mr. Edward Fellows, is authenticated by the writer's name. The Prelate who is the subject of this revelation—an unhappy one even if necessary—is becoming a bye-word.

'The English Constitution Vindicated,' (Masters,) is a confutation of Dr. Newman's Lectures. We hardly see the force of the title; but as an argument it is clear, and often deep. From the nature of the case it indicates rather than exhausts the controversy: for his main principle we can recommend this writer, who takes the name of 'Presbyter.'

Dr. Tischendorf has favoured us with a critical edition of the 'Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha,' (Lipsiæ: Avenarius et Mendelssohn; London: Dulau.) It is quite remarkable, that while general attention has been given to the Apocryphal Gospels, most of these Apocryphal Acts are now published for the first time. They have been known to Patristic scholars: occasionally they have been cited, but to our own times has been reserved a complete edition. The documents now printed are thirteen in number: of these Dr. Tischendorf prints from the Codices—1. The Acts of Philip. 2. The Acts of Philip in Greece. 3. The Acts of Matthew. 4. Consummatio Thomæ. 5. The Acts of Bartholomew. 6. The Acts of Thaddæus. 7. The Acts of John. Of the remaining six works, three—viz. 8. The Acts of Thomas; 9. Of Peter and Paul; 10. Of Andrew and Matthew—were published by Thilo in the years 1823—1846. 11. The Acts of Barnabas were published in an imperfect form by Papebroche in 1698: they are now restored. 12. The Acts of Andrew, *i.e.* the encyclical letter of the Clergy of Achaia on his martyrdom, were published from the Bodleian MS. at Leipsic in 1749, while 13. The Acts of Paul and Thecla, are printed in Grabe's 'Spicilegium.' In a full and able critical preface, Dr. Tischendorf discusses the age and authenticity of these curious and venerable monuments of Christian antiquity.

Mr. H. S. Tremeneere, under the title of 'The Political Experience of the Ancients, in its bearing on modern times,' (Murray,) has hit upon an excellent idea. He epitomizes the political writings of Aristotle, Plato, Polybius, and Cicero, and shows that there existed a catena of authorities on principles of government universally recognised down to the time of Locke.

M. Audin's thoroughly French and lively 'History of Henry VIII.' (Dolman,) has been translated by a Mr. E. G. Browne, a 'recent convert.' We have not examined the translation further than to see that it is an ugly double-columned book. The original we remember well: and it is caustic, bitter, unscrupulous, one-sided, and ultramontane—but very amusing.

'The Nourishment of the Christian Soul,' (Masters,) is from the French of Pinart; it is the companion, or continuation, of an affecting work by the same writer, 'Meditations on the Suffering Life of our Lord,' &c. Both appear under the editorship of the Bishop of Brechin, and both are of a spiritual and solemn character. They are 'adapted' to our own use: and their object is to assist and prevent vagueness in meditation.

Murray's 'Reading for the Rail'—a lively and tempting miscellany—gives

us two instalments: 'Deeds of Naval Daring,' which we should say was not safe for mothers to put into the hands of boys who have decidedly nautical appetencies: and 'Music and the Art of Dress,' which, at least the latter, lies under the like difficulties as to our daughters.

Mr. E. A. Freeman's 'Paper on the Preservation and Restoration of Ancient Monuments,' (J. H. Parker,) was read before the Archæological Institute at their recent *séance* at Bristol. It attracted, as it deserved, a good deal of notice; and, as its author doubtless expected, it provoked unfavourable remarks. It is clever, suggestive, and well written; not without strong expressions, for Mr. Freeman thinks decidedly, and expresses himself accordingly. In some notes, Mr. Freeman takes, or makes, occasion to review his reviewers. In the castigation which he bestows on a writer in Fraser, who, himself a reviewer, and an 'anonymous hired writer,' felt, after the manner of his sect, it to be his function to abuse reviews in general with a bitterness of execration only suitable to the pen of one whose vocation it is to rebuke strong writing, we for the most part concur. 'Tis sport to see the engineer,' &c.

Much above the average of tour books is 'Letters from Italy and Vienna.' (Macmillan.) The writer is observant—generally candid and fair: his language is graphic, and he does justice to the good, while he is severe to the evil, both of his own religious system and that of others. He does not use guide-book slang, and sees with his own eyes. We detected one slight inaccuracy, p. 67. 'To prevent any egregious blunder in an ignorant priest, I observed that the quantities were *marked* in their books.' Was not this the ordinary accentuation to direct the intoning: the 'rather than'?

There is a good deal of simple vigour—not the worse, perhaps, for recalling days gone by—in Archdeacon Berens' 'Adherence to the Church.' (Rivingtons.) For ordinary cases of distribution in villages infested by 'meetings,' this is a suitable little collection.

The second part of the 'Small Book' on the 'State of Man subsequent to the Promulgation of Christianity,' (Pickering,) by no means disposes us to reverse or to modify the opinion which we were obliged to give of its predecessor. In many respects, indeed, this writer deteriorates as he advances: not content with a latitudinarian view for himself, he misrepresents the orthodox and historical belief; as in the account which he gives, p. 18, of the doctrine referred to Arius, or Areius, as the present writer prefers to spell it.

Contemporaneously with our last number appeared the 'Edinburgh Review.' This respectable journal was disfigured with an article, on which literature and the public sense of outraged decency soon set its seal. We believe that hitherto the press, in all its organs, and representing all views, parties, and polemics, has been unanimous in condemning the venomous and personal attack contained in the paper headed 'Bishop Philpotts,' which appeared in the January number of our contemporary. The Bishop replied in a most temperate and dignified pamphlet, 'A Letter to Sir Robert Inglis on certain Statements in an Article of the Edinburgh Review,' (Murray,) the

success of which was complete. The 'Reviewer' has, we believe, issued a 'Rejoinder,' (Longman,) which was quite superfluous: the trial was over, and the verdict given. Besides, the libeller was understood; his object was transparent. A captain who neglects his company and his duties, is not very likely to find acceptance if he writes against his commanding officer. In a diocese like that of Exeter, we can quite understand that one whose whole episcopate has been devoted to work, and to improve the discipline and laborious life of his Clergy, may have made among certain specimens of them personal enemies. We only sincerely regret for the honour of literature that a journal like the *Edinburgh Review* should have lent itself to the unworthy work of permitting its channels to be made the means of avenging a merited slight—especially in the case of an English Bishop. A curious anecdote has come to our knowledge with respect to this article and the Bishop of Exeter's reply. An individual American Churchman has, at his own expense, caused an advertisement to be stitched into every copy of the *Edinburgh Review* circulated in America (where it is reprinted)—upwards of 4,000 in number—offering a copy *gratis* of an American edition, of the Bishop's 'Letter to Sir R. Inglis' to every subscriber to the *Review*. This high-minded act on the other side of the Atlantic almost atones for the miserable spirit displayed by the person who gave occasion to it.

Another, and in some respects more painful, incident connected with the diocese of Exeter has occurred. Miss Sellon's name and labours are as widely known as the Church of England. Her institutions and the labours and loving-kindness of the devoted sisterhood of which she is the Superior, are a boast of our own days. And yet a man has been found to sneer, not so much at the peculiarities of an individual, as at the 'Sisters of Mercy,' as such,—or else why maliciously quote the title as an eminent jest?—a gentleman, by education, has been found to publish a lady's private letters without her consent; a Clergyman has been found to pass over the whole life of many women, spent in visiting the sick, and feeding the hungry, and teaching the ignorant, for a matter of crosses, and a pair of candlesticks, and a picture. One Mr. James Spurrell has got hold of 'a Sister who has recently seceded,' to use his own words, and as it would seem for the especial edification of those who laugh at all religion, prints gossip about the way, if uncommon, in which recluse women try to do good to their neighbours. He calls his pamphlet, 'Miss Sellon and "the Sisters of Mercy,"' and it has Mr. Hatchard's respectable name affixed to it. With the Bishop of Exeter we stigmatize Mr. Spurrell's share in this transaction as simply 'infamous.' At the Bishop's desire Miss Sellon prepares a 'Reply.' (Masters.) This is guarded, temperate, and convincing: on one or two points Miss Sellon expresses herself in such a way, as to the moral interpretation of the rule which gives permission to the Sisters to retire, and on the matter of obedience, that the Bishop, who was *ex officio* visitor, feels himself called upon, in a 'Letter to Miss Sellon,' (Murray,) to relinquish that office. If unavoidable, this result is certainly to be deplored: but it is some alleviation to be assured that the good work is so far consolidated that it can stand alone. We

trust that Miss Sellon's vindication, complete as far as all essentials go, coupled with two testimonies to the facts of the practical institutions in which the sisterhood is engaged, furnished by the Plymouth Clergy, and printed as an Appendix to the Bishop's 'Letter,' will give renewed energy to her friends, and confidence, and perhaps other lessons, to herself. We may, perhaps, regret some of Miss Sellon's language: we may think her views, both of herself, and of her own, and of the Bishop's, position exaggerated. But were her views of her vocation theoretically more extreme than they are, it were very base to forget that her character has also a practical side by way of complement and abatement. High as is her estimate of her position and her aspirations, her actual self-denial and working virtues are higher. Before we criticise too coldly or too severely the sentiments of working persons, let us do justice to the working life. This is a question of something else than taste. We may not like Miss Sellon's mode of expressing herself: but she has paid dearly for exaggerated language. When we have many Miss Sellons we will permit criticism more readily than we are disposed to do at present. Mr. Spurrell certainly has yet his credentials to produce for the dangerous office of 'accuser of the brethren.

Anything which proceeds from Dr. Maitland's pen is sure to be learned, entertaining, and original, if partial. His recently printed 'Eight Essays,' (Rivingtons,) with most of which we were familiar, quite come up to our expectations: and in this quarter they are always high. If the accomplished writer intends us to accept his views on art and its literalness, we do not accompany him: but we cannot be quite certain that there is not in these speculations a refined irony. Does Dr. Maitland understand, (p. 117,) that the allegorical Bas-Reliefs on the Fish-street Hill monument are not there now. The inscription was erased: but King Charles and Duke James, and London weeping most stony tears, are all there, with the congenial Cupids and uncongenial Genius.

'Polonius: a Collection of Wise Saws and Modern Instances,' (Pickering,) is a book of proverbs and adages. From the nature of the case it contains sayings of various proprieties and principles: and on this account shares the moral disadvantages under which all such Morality-Books labour. A collection of apophthegms or *Ana* from a single writer or thinker has its value, because a definite one, and as the reflection of a single mind: but if Carlyle and Newman, Pascal, Goethe, and Bishop Butler, can be worked up into a consistent ethical whole, it is curious. By the way, in all such books we should like references: if the sayings are good for anything, we occasionally wish for the context. Now, to append 'Seneca,' or 'Edinburgh Review,' or 'Plato,' is at least perplexing.

Mr. Goode, the stormy petrel of his party, has printed a 'Reply to Archdeacon Churton and Chancellor Harrington,' (Hatchard,) on the 'Non-Episcopal Question.' Seeing Mr. Goode in print about six times a quarter, and always in the contradictory way, we must do him the justice of saying that his friends give him no respite: the solitary man of letters

of an illiterate party has to do more than a working man's share of work. Just to think of a life—which is Mr. Goode's—spent from year's end to year's end groping and delving in the unfathomable rubbish of Travers and Cartwright, and the illustrious obscure of a defunct Puritanism. Mr. Goode has a severe price to pay for his literary Swerga. The function of Answerer-General has, of course, its difficulties and unpleasantnesses. Mr. Goode must make up his mind to the inconveniences as well as honours of his solitary position. To the world it argues a captious, querulous, snarling temper: but there is no remedy for it. 'It is' Mr. Goode's 'nature to'—as Dr. Watts expresses it—*i.e.* to argufy and to contradict. He advertises, we see, something fresh against the Bishop of Exeter, a matter in which he was not called upon to interfere, 'in defence of his Metropolitan,' except on the ground that he obtained a good living for abusing the Bishop of Exeter, and he must render the customary suit and service.

In 'A Few Words,' &c. (Rivingtons,) we think Chancellor Harington has disposed of Mr. Goode's verbosity on a question which, while the simple fact remains that these non-episcopal ordinations are not acknowledged in this Church of England, never required half a page of discussion.

An able and vigorous coadjutor has appeared in the 'Scottish Magazine,' (new series,) (Lendrum,) of which we have received the first volume.

'The Patriarch of the Nile,' by J. D. Pigott. (Rivingtons.) We hardly think the subject very susceptible of poetical treatment; but the writer has done his best.

'The Three Paths,' by the Hon. Mrs. Anderson, (Rivingtons,) we think would be benefited by condensation.

The South Church Union have adopted tactics of a singularly bold and aggressive character, and, as we hear, with considerable success. Selecting Brighton, the metropolis of idleness, and gaiety, and lounging, of a literary as well as another kind, some active persons have hit upon the scheme of delivering public lectures—and, without mincing the matter,—'On Tractarianism.' (Masters.) Mr. Newland's lecture on this subject is before us: assuming the policy and propriety of the thing itself, Mr. Newland is eminently qualified for this work. It is plain-spoken—picturesque—and very popular in style and manner. For the lecture-room these are great qualities. Mr. Newland calls a spade a spade: and if he could find out a more intelligible and vernacular name he would not scruple to use it. That there is a tendency in this to rudeness, is to our minds no real objection: the people who are addressed are rude, if not in manners yet, in information: the thing to be done being agreed upon, *this* is the only way of doing it. Mr. Neale—of whose versatile powers this is only another specimen—follows, with the 'Bible and the Bible only the Religion of Protestants'—a merciless and sarcastic demolition of this silly axiom. High colouring and a decided touch these lectures require: but we detected Mr. Neale in an unnecessary piece of exaggeration, p. 18. 'When Hoadley was denying the sacraments... when Cornwallis was dancing away his

evenings at Lambeth, till George III. peremptorily interfered.' We have heard of a saltatory chancellor in Hatton, but we never heard of an archbishop dancing *in persona*, as Mr. Neale assures us. What King George interfered with was—not Archbishop Cornwallis dancing himself, or giving dances to others: but—with Mrs. Cornwallis's routs; which, though akin to, is certainly not quite the same thing as 'Cornwallis dancing away his evenings at Lambeth.'

'The Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal,' (Grant,) has reached us in its first complete volume. It is a periodical of a high range of intelligence, and cannot but be useful and acceptable.

'Tracts on Catholic Unity,' (Darling.) The purpose of these tracts is to collect into an accessible form the arguments and principles advanced by the Syncretic school. As a contribution to peace and a healing measure, we presume that no Christian mind will refuse to accept the purpose of such a series. The Evangelical Alliance takes one form of the purpose; Davenport (Santa Clara) another; Bossuet another; Leibnitz another; Mr. Wix, in the beginning of the century, another; Mr. Appleyard recently another; while neither the attempts made by the nonjurors or by some of ourselves to open up intercourse with the Oriental Churches are to be excluded from this peace-loving end. The Editors are members of the Church of England. A trace of exaggerated language is beginning to display itself in No. 4, from which we thought its predecessors free.

Dr. Peile's 'Annotations on the Apostolical Epistles,' (Rivingtons,) has reached its fourth and concluding volume. In so vast a body of annotations we cannot be expected to concur entirely. But the learning, diligence, fairness, and scholarship exhibited go far towards redeeming the imputation under which we lie for neglecting exegetical studies.

'How can we best have Three Services instead of Two?' is a question 'examined and replied to by Mr. W. J. Stracey.' (Masters.) Mr. Stracey confines himself to the Sunday services. He argues, and we are not prepared to pronounce decidedly and at once against the view, that when the Litany is ordered to be said *after* Morning Prayer, this does not, or may not necessarily, mean '*immediately after*.' All that it need mean, he says, is that the Litany is not to be used before Morning Prayer. He then goes on to show that it is not implied that the Litany should be invariably said before the Holy Communion; from which his conclusion is, that the Morning Prayer should make one Sunday Office, the Liturgy the second, or afternoon, and Evening Prayer the third. We are glad to find Mr. Stracey giving no countenance to the unfortunate innovation of an evening celebration of the Eucharist.

'The Ark, and other Sermons,' by Mr. R. Bellis, (J. W. Parker,) in so far as it claims readers on the strength of 'a Preface by Rev. A. M'Caul, D.D., Professor of Divinity at King's College, London,' is a literary fraud. The Preface is a couple of pages, in which the reverend Professor idealises Popish sermons and rationalizing sermons, and then assures us that

Mr. Bellis' discourses are neither one nor the other. Perhaps: but, to change the Professor's antithesis, they 'are to us a proof of the possibility of being pretentious without originality, and pert without power.' Instead of printing his own, 'the Curate of High Wycombe and Theological Associate of King's College' would have been much better employed in reading other people's sermons.

A second volume of 'Village Sermons,' by Mr. A. Baxter, of Hampreston, from the same publisher, struck us much by their simplicity and suitability to place and occasion.

We can assure Mr. Wilmshurst that we have no especial fault to find with his 'Sermons.' (Masters.) He intimates that they were 'drawn up under peculiar circumstances:' and we are not concerned to be inquisitive what those circumstances were. The writer is very modest: he does not pretend to originality. He has read the right sort of books, and his sermons are in doctrine a syllabus—not always accurate, however—of Bull and Newman on Justification, and on the harmony of the two Apostles. He seems to be sound on other points: and there are in his sermons traces of a practical spirit and a real appreciation of the wants of those he is addressing. But the first sermon we turned to (Serm. iv. p. 33) commences thus: 'Conversion is the responsibility of man yielding to the suasive influence of the preventing grace of the Holy Spirit as it would lead him, (after it has laid open to him his lost estate as a fallen creature, and the necessity of his being recovered from that state, before he can be fitted for Heaven,) to lay hold of by faith through its appointed channel of Baptism, that gift of grace which is ordained to effect this recovery, and to accomplish that increase in holiness which he is capable of now, as a Baptised man, he is placed in a recovered state, viz.: Christ's righteousness.' Now, supposing this sentence to be grammar, which it is not—and admitting its good intention to express accurately a technical statement in theology—we ask one question: Mr. Wilmshurst is Curate of Kirby Muxloe and Braunstone, and we presume that the rustics of those famous villages were expected to hear the sermon decorated with this beginning. Did it ever occur to Mr. Wilmshurst what impression such an exordium would make upon the congregation of Muxloe? It is the boast of our Church that its services should be 'understood of the people:' why should not her Clergy extend this merciful provision to the Sermon?

Mr. Stuart's Sermon on the 'Pew System,' (Masters,) is unusually interesting; the author having shown his thorough appreciation of his principle by building and endowing a handsome new Church without pews and pew-rents.

Of Sermons, we have to acknowledge: 1. A Volume (the second) displaying considerable force of language and an animated pictorial style, together with sound and practical doctrine, by Mr. Edward Miller, of Bognor. (Rivingtons.)—2. A Volume by Dr. Wilkinson, preached in the chapel of Marlborough College. (Murray.) These are generally so useful, so much to the purpose, so direct and intelligible, that in alluding—grace-

fully enough—to his unpolemical object in preaching them, we think the respected preacher might have spared some observations in his preface which look like unnecessary reflections on others. It is Dr. Wilkinson's especial purpose to teach his boys; it may be somebody else's purpose to discharge other functions in the Church. Why should not each hold his own—and do good each in his own way? Even to 'discuss management clauses,' as he puts it, may, in the great Ecclesiastical Economy, have a purpose as useful as the doctrine of the verbs in μ . We are sure that Dr. Wilkinson acknowledges this as frankly as we admit that the master of a great school has a great religious charge; and it is a consolation to know that in most of our public schools—and most certainly in Marlborough, under Dr. Wilkinson's auspices—this responsibility is acted up to:—as we are reminded by a good single Sermon, 'Witnesses to the Truth,' preached at Harrow School by Dr. Vaughan, on the death of Mr. Keary, an Assistant-Master, (J. W. Parker,) as well as by a very graceful and ingenious 'Founders' Day Sermon,' preached at the Charter-house, 'Education the Business of Life,' (Walker,) by Mr. Phillott, lately one of the masters. We have also received, 1. 'Deserters from the Congregation,' also by Dr. Vaughan, (J. W. Parker,) on the reopening of S. Martin's, Leicester. We cannot coincide in some of its statements. 2. 'The Ministry of Reconciliation,' by Mr. E. T. Vaughan, (J. W. Parker,) the Vicar, preached on the same occasion. 3. 'Ritual Worship,' (Harrison,) preached at Leeds at a consecration—a very good sermon—by Mr. C. Dodgson. 4. Mr. B. Wilson's 'Four Sermons on the Deity and Incarnation of our Lord,' (Rivingtons,) preached at Fordham. 5. Mr. Nowell's 'Farewell Sermon' at S. Mary, Leeds. (Harrison.) 6. 'One and All,' an able lecture, by Mr. Newland, delivered at Stoke Damerel, (Masters.)

While we are at press, we have received Mr. C. Wordsworth's 'Letter to Mr. Gladstone,' (J. H. Parker.) It appears to be a protest against the possibility of combining liberal politics with Church principles.

INDEX TO VOL. XXIII.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Æschylus, Paley's edition of the Supplices, 453—487. Neglect of Æschylus, 453. Previous editions, 454. Detailed criticisms and explanations, 455—487.
American Church [*Caswall's America and the American Church*], 329—363. Mr. Caswall's practical acquaintance with his subject, 329. Relations of English and American Churches, 330, 331. History of the American Church, 332—338. Bishop Chase, 339—344. Mr. Caswall's career, 345—348. Bishop Doane and his institutions, 349. Synods, 350. General sketch of the constitution and practice of the American Church, 351—363.

B.

Budhism—Tartary and Thibet [*Travels by M. Hue. Spence Hardy's Eastern Monachism, &c.*], 249—328. The Lazarist Mission, 249, 250. Quits China, 252. Hospitality of the Orientals, 253, 254. Arrives at the Blue Town, 257—260. The Tartar rule and character, 261. Thibet, 262. Parallel between Lassa and Rome, 263. Life at, and departure from Lassa, 264—273. Return of the Mission to China, 274—277. Several views of Budhism, 278—328.

C.

Clerical education [*Mr. Freeman's Plea for Education of the Clergy*], 217—236. Analysis of Mr. Freeman's pamphlet, 217—223. English education deficient, 224. *Desiderata* in special clerical training, 225—236.

NO. LXXVI.—N.S.

College Life in time of James I. [*Sir Symonds D'Ewes' Journal*], 30—44. Value of this Journal, 30, 31. Picture of the age, 32—44.
Conception, the Immaculate [*Perrone's Disquisition on the Immaculate Conception*], 364—425. What the 'Conception' is, 364, 365. Source of immaculateness, 366. View of the doctrine, 367. The Canons of Lyons, 368. S. Bernard, P. Lombard, 369, 370. Council of Basle, 371. University of Paris, 372. Progress of the doctrine, 373, 374. Its proofs, 375; from Scripture and the Fathers, 376, &c. How they fail, and uncertainty among its advocates, 376—421. Appendix. Office of the Feast, &c. 422—425.
Convocation in 1852 [*Pearce's Law of Convocation*], 488—494. Growth and progress of the desire for Synodical action, 488. The new Convocation, 489. Authentic account of the proceedings of the last Session of Convocation, 490—494.
Copleston, Bishop [*Memoir of Bishop Copleston*], 1—29. Popularity of Dr. Copleston, 1. His biography, 2. Tutor of Oriel, 3. His general character and politics: Dean and Bishop, 4—15. A disappointing character, 16. Incapable of acting upon the Church movement, 17—29.
Creasy's Decisive Battles [*The Fifteen Decisive Battles, &c.*] 207—216. Which are the fifteen battles, 207. Marathon, 208, 209. Syracuse, 210. Arbela, 211. The Metaurus, 212. Victory of Arminius, 213. Châlons, 214. Charles Martel's victory over the Saracens, 215, 216.
Cuthbert, S. [*Eyre's History of S. Cuthbert*], 64—88. Obscurity of S. Cuthbert's age, 64. His life, 65, and its lessons, 66—81. Miracles attributed to him, 85. Hagiology in general, 85—88.

M M

J.

Jansenists, the; and recent Ultramontaniam [*Rohrbacher's History of the Church—Tregelles on Jansenism*], 89—152. What the History of the Church is, 89. Rohrbacher's work, 89—91. Antonio de Dominis in 1602, 93. His struggles and history, 93—100. Richer, 101. The Abbé of S. Cyran and Vincent of Paul, 102, 103. Jansenius, 104. Rohrbacher's exhibition of the Roman doctrine on grace, 105. That of S. Thomas, 106. Of Molina, 107. Of Jansenius in the *Augustinus*, 108. Dispute on the Five Propositions, 109. Progress of the controversy, 110. Decline and fall of Jansenism in France, 127. The Church of Utrecht—its connexion with Jansenism, 128. History of the protesting Episcopate, and its recent and present condition, 129—152.

M.

Mormons, the [*The Mormons, or Latter-Day Saints*], 186—206. The 'American Mahomet,' 186, 187. Joseph Smith, 188, 189. The Mormon creed, 190, 191; its reference to Scripture, 192, 193; its hymnology, 194; its origin, 195—197. Progress of Mormonism, 198—206.

O.

Ossoli, Margaret Fuller [*Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli*], 426—452. American estimate of celebrities, 426. Margaret Fuller's birth and education, 427. Her career and character, 428—452.

P.

Ponsonby, Lady E., Novels by [*The Discipline of Life, &c.*], 45—63. Is fiction to be abandoned? 45. Province of fiction, 46—49. Lady E. Ponsonby as a novelist, 49. Criticism of her novels, 50—63.

S.

Sterling, John [*Carlyle's Life of Sterling*], 153—185. Carlyle and Hare, 153. Carlyle's sense of sham, 154; its use and abuse, 155—161. Sterling, 161; his life and character, 162, 163. Sterling's father, 164—167. The present biography criticised, 168—185.

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JANUARY.—Tales of a London Parish—Cousin Eustace—Birke's Life of Bickersteth—Home is Home—Record of Exeter Synod—Scudamore on Romanism—England before the Norman Conquest—Rural Thoughts, &c.—Corner's History of Greece—Tales of the Empire—The Pastor Visiting—Christ in Hades—Bennett's Sermons—Armitstead's Parochial Papers—The Monthly Packet—The Lily and the Bee—Heygate's Care of the Soul—Church Catechism expanded—Westcott's Elements of Gospel Harmony—Mahan on Faith—Stapf on Education—Kennaway's Sermons—Parker's Pascal Letters on Irish Reformation—Currey's Lectures—Foulkes' Manual of Ecclesiastical History—Bishop Hall's Meditations—Welch Sketches—Babylon and Jerusalem—Mould, Baron, and Laurence, on Visiting the Sick—Bishop Pearson's Annals—Montgomery's Poems—A Gift at Confirmation—New Zealand—On State of Man, &c.—Lees on Wild Flowers—Hayman's Dialogues—Walcott on the Ordinal—Palin's History of Church, &c.—Land of the Morning—First Hebrew Book—Simpson on Italian Literature—Oxford Statutes—Schoell on British History—Cockrell's Wells Cathedral—Moody's New Testament—Forbes on the Eucharist—Whitaker's Almanacs—Parker on the Church—Meyrick and Debarry on the Spanish Church—Vaux's Handbook—Reading for the Rail—Maurice on the Old Testament—Holmes on Diocesan Synods—Pound on Ditto—Harington on LV. Canon—Armstrong on Penitentiaries—Denison, Newland, and Hare, on Education—Jackson's Tracts—Sermons, &c. by Dr. Crosse, Bishop Doane, &c.—Bowman to Medical Students—Bowdler on Confession, &c.—Caswall's American Church—Williams on the Apocalypse—The Truth about Rome—Bishop of Oxford's Jubilee Sermon—Sermons, &c. by Huxtable, Vaughan, Williams, Pearson, Hook, Bishop Fulford, Perry, &c.—Postscript, &c.

APRIL.—Review of Mr. Barber's Case—Clinton's Fasti Hellenici—Hensfrey's Vegetation of Europe—Allison's Life of Marlborough—Ellis on Irish Ethnology—Manual of Hebrew Antiquities—Watkins on the Human Hand—Bowen's Mount Athos—The Sarum Psalter—Protestant Prayer-Book—Gentle Influences—Bishop of Tasmania's Charge—Bishop of Guiana's Charge—Gladstone's Letter to Bishop of Aberdeen—Cautus' Reply—Badger's Nestorians—Humphry's Edition of Theophilus—Bishop Doane's Protest and Appeal—Keith Johnston's Physical Atlas and School Atlas—Skinner's Guide for Lent—Liddell on Division of Services—Bennett's Pastoral Letter—Woodford's Lectures—Sayings and Doings of Bishop of Manchester—Confutation of Dr Newman—Tischendorf's Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles—Tremere's Ancient Politics—Audin's Henry VIII.—Nourishment of Christian Soul—Reading for the Rail—Freeman on the Preservation of Ancient Monuments—Letters from Italy and Vienna—Berens on the Church—State of Man subsequent to Christianity—Edinburgh Review and Bishop of Exeter—Spurrell, and 'The Sisters of Mercy—Dr. Maitland's Eight Essays—Polonius &c.—Mr. Goode's Reply to Archdeacon Churton and Chancellor Harington—Harington's Few Words—Scottish Magazine—Pigott's Patriarch of the Nile—The Three Paths—The South Church Union—Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal—Tracts on Catholic Unity—Dr. Pells's Annotations on the Epistles—Stracey's Three Services instead of Two—The Ark, &c.—Baxter's Village Sermons—Wilmshurst's Sermons—Stuart on the Pew System—Wordsworth's Letter to Mr. Gladstone—Sermons by Miller, Wilkinson, Vaughan, Phillott, Dodgson, Wilson, Nowell, and Newland.

